



Med
K38953

THE EDINBURGH REVIEW,

MR. CORNEWALL LEWIS,

AND THE REV. DR. MAITLAND,

ON

MESMERISM.

*A communication from a Gentleman in England to a Friend
in France.*

LONDON:

HIPPOLYTE BAILLIÈRE, 219, REGENT STREET.

DUBLIN: FANNIN & CO., GRAFTON STREET.

EDINBURGH: MACLACHLAN & CO.

GLASGOW: M. OGLE & SON.

1851.

12

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WALTON AND MITCHELL,
WARDOUR STREET.




2784181

WELLCOME INSTITUTE LIBRARY	
Call.	welMOMec
Call	
No.	WM

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE publication of this Pamphlet has been delayed on account of a rumour that Dr. Maitland was designing a reply to the reviews in *The Zoist*: but, as no reply has appeared after the lapse of above two years, that expectation is abandoned.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

<https://archive.org/details/b28103452>

THE EDINBURGH REVIEW, &c.,

ON

MESMERISM.

London.

MY DEAR SIR,—

IN reference to the subject concerning which you were, some time ago, making some remarks to me, I send you an extract from a very able article in the *Edinburgh Review*, (of Lewis, on “The Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion,”) as I know that in France many persons seldom or never see that *Review*.

I send you also extracts from a pamphlet on the subject by the Rev. Dr. Maitland; and likewise two reviews of that pamphlet which lately appeared in a periodical.

The *arguments* of Dr. Maitland are fully discussed in the reviews of his work. But the alleged *facts* brought forward by him, the reviewer merely refers to, as supposing his readers to have the pamphlet before them. But you, probably, have never seen it. And I have therefore extracted from it the Notices of Cases.

It is to be observed, however, that Dr. Maitland does not pledge himself to the truth of all the alleged facts, or to his own full belief of them. But he considers, I conceive, that to refer them *all* to imposture or delusion, would require (considering how numerous and respectably they were attested) a much greater amount of easy faith than to admit them all. And if one supposes but one-fourth of the cases he notices (though he might have added many more) to be well authenticated, this would be more than sufficient to prove that there must be *something*—and something very important—in mesmeric agency.

And I may add, that this is the belief of many intelligent persons—especially of the medical profession, who are commonly supposed to be entire unbelievers; besides those of them (and I could prove to you the existence of such), who make a *public* profession of entire disbelief, contrary to their real opinions *privately* acknowledged. Besides these, there are others who have openly ridiculed several alleged cases which they profess—and probably with sincerity—to regard as impostures; and who, while they speak of what they *dis*-believe, make no mention of what they do believe. And thus many are led to suppose that these persons set down the whole as a tissue of Quackery, though they neither think so, nor have ever expressly said so.

In reality, a mixture of truth with exaggeration and fabrication,—as of genuine with counterfeit coin,—is to be found in most departments of human life.

I am, my dear Sir, yours faithfully,

* * * * *

To * * * * *

Marseilles.

Extract from "The Edinburgh Review" for April, 1850.

"MESMERISM certainly is *not* plausible. That it should be in the power of the mesmeriser, without actual contact, merely by gesticulation and by an exertion of will, to produce in his patient the trance which, in the language of the science, is called somnambulism; that the somnambulist should lose his general perception of the exterior world, should not hear the conversation around him, should not feel pressure from external bodies, should endure, without pain, a surgical operation, but should receive new powers of perception with respect to those with whom he is put into what they call relation, should read their thoughts, see the state of their internal organs, detect in them any disorder, and know instinctively what are its appropriate remedies,—all these are phenomena for which we are unprepared by any previous experience. They are not, to use a common word in its derivative sense, likely. They do not resemble anything that

we have previously known. We ought not to admit them, except on proof, more than sufficient to support propositions supported by analogy. But it is impossible to deny that to many men of high moral and scientific character the proofs already adduced have appeared sufficient. Nor is it, we think, to be denied that this number is increasing, and that mesmerism is assuming an importance which must, at no distant time, occasion a formal inquiry, in which its errors, which probably are many, will be separated from, what we may be sure are also many, its truths.

“We cannot quit this episode without supporting our views by the authority of a writer whose knowledge and ability none of our readers will undervalue.

“In his ‘Sequel to the Outlines of Medical Proof,’ Dr. Mayo urges with great force the expediency of an inquiry, either by the College of Physicians, or under a government commission, into the merits of homœopathy, hydropathy, and mesmerism. The following is a portion of his argument;—

“‘The position of mesmerism, with respect to the public, demands not jesting and abuse, but very serious consideration. The reality of those phenomena of trance which have been brought to bear upon the treatment of disease, and the removal of physical pain, is undeniable, however disposed we may be to exercise a chronic scepticism with respect to certain other transcendental phenomena of the mesmeric state. With respect to mesmeric therapeutics, besides other questions which would spring out of an inquiry, one question would arise of a very practical nature; namely, whether a certain measure of beneficial results being conceded to mesmerism, the extent of benefit is commensurate with the contingent mischievousness of the means employed. Now the public has a right to demand, and to demand of us, some answer to the questions, whether the asserted removal of disorders on mesmeric principles has been truly effected—whether the objections above hinted at to their removal on these principles may be overruled—whether, in regard to this latter point, a line can be drawn between a legitimate and an illegitimate use of the expedients of the science.

“‘For great, indeed, is the curative effect held out by these practitioners, and held out with no slight degree of proof. The talents and high scientific position of Dr. Elliotson are well known. It would be superfluous, and therefore impertinent, to say that his veracity is unimpeachable, but for the unscrupulousness with which charges of insincerity have been brought against professors of mesmerism.

‘ Now Dr. Elliotson has recently published a case of cancer, ‘ apparently absorbed under mesmeric treatment. Its cancerous nature had been recognized by Mr. Symes, Mr. Samuel Cooper, and Dr. Ashburner, as well as by Dr. Elliotson. ‘ But, in fact, the cases of cure, less marvellous in kind than ‘ this, of various diseases under mesmeric agency, are too ‘ numerous to be put aside without inquiry. They are numerous to an extent which will induce the public to accept ‘ the *methodus medendi*, with all its presumable evils, unless ‘ we place it before them, after investigation, in a harmless ‘ form, if such a form can be devised, or convict the whole ‘ system of vice or imposture.

“ ‘ An inquiry of this kind may no doubt terminate only ‘ in incertitude. In this case, if the requisite means have ‘ been taken to elicit truth, and to secure ourselves against ‘ error, we shall at least have done our duty. But it is conceivable, with respect to homœopathy, that as disease can ‘ arise from infinitesimal causes, so infinitesimal remedies ‘ may sometimes prove sanative ; it is conceivable, with respect ‘ to mesmerism, that the influence of the trance, and of the ‘ sympathy, may be admitted by us to possess an extent of ‘ medical advantage, which may exceed the disadvantage of ‘ the peculiar kind of possession involved in this treatment.’*

“ Dr. Elliotson has all the qualities which Mr. Lewis requires† in an unexceptionable witness to a matter of perception. The facts, so far as they were matters of perception, fell within the range of his senses ; he attended to them ; he possesses a fair amount of intelligence and memory ; and he is free from any sinister or misleading interest. His interest, indeed, would have led him to conceal almost all that he has told ; for his connexion with mesmerism gave to his reputation a taint of quackery, which, for a time, materially injured his practice. He has also all the rarer qualities which Mr. Lewis requires in a competent authority in matters of inference,‡—talents, learning, experience, and integrity. If his evidence and his opinions are to be scornfully rejected because he relates phenomena which are not supported by analogical facts, how is the existence of such phenomena to be proved ? Are we to adopt the pyrrhonism which maintains that it is more probable that any amount of testimony should be false than that any thing differing from what we believe to be the ordinary course of nature should have occurred ? On such principles the King of Siam was justified in disbelieving that water can become solid : and the Emperor

* Sequel. pp. 37—40.

† P. 21.

‡ P. 27.

of China might refuse to be convinced that it is possible to send a message from Pekin to Canton in a second.

“ Since these remarks were written we have received two papers from Calcutta. One is a ‘ Report of the Committee appointed by Government to observe and report upon surgical operations by Dr. J. Esdaile upon patients under alleged mesmeric agency ;’ printed by the Government in 1846. The other is a ‘ Record of Cases treated in the Mesmeric Hospital, from November, 1846, to May, 1847.’ with reports of the official visitors ; printed by the Government in 1847.

Some of the diseases prevalent in India require operations longer and more painful than almost any that are endured in Europe. Dr. Esdaile, the superintendent of a hospital near Calcutta, had for some time prepared his patients by throwing them into mesmeric sleep. Lord Dalhousie, anticipating Dr. Mayo’s suggestion, appointed a committee (or, as we should call it, a commission), consisting of seven persons, four of whom were medical men, to report on this practice. An apartment in the native hospital of Calcutta was assigned as the scene of the experiment, and ten patients as its subjects.

“ The Committee thus describe the process, and its results :—

“ “ The mesmeriser was seated behind the patient, leaning over him, the right hand generally placed on the pit of the stomach, and passes were made with one or both hands along the face, chiefly over the eyes. The mesmeriser breathed frequently and gently over the patient’s lips, eyes, and nostrils. Profound silence was observed. These processes were continued for about two hours in each day. In three cases no result was obtained. In seven cases, in a period varying from one to seven sittings, deep sleep followed. This sleep in its most perfect state differed from ordinary natural sleep as follows : The individual could not be aroused by loud noises, the pupils were insensible to light, and great, and in some cases apparently perfect, insensibility to pain was witnessed on burning, pinching, and cutting the skin and other sensitive organs. It differed from that which would be produced by narcotic drugs in the quickness with which, in eight cases out of ten, the patient was awake, after certain transverse passes and fanning by the mesmeriser, and blowing upon the face and on the eyes, —in the natural condition of the pupils of the eyes and the conjunctiva in all the cases after awaking,—in the absence of stertorous breathing and of subsequent delirium or hallucination ; and of many other symptoms familiar to medical

‘observers, which are produced by alcoholic liquors, opium, hemp, and other narcotic drugs. In seven cases surgical operations were performed in the state of sleep above described. In the case of Nilmony Dutt there was not the slightest indication of the operation having been felt by the patient. It consisted in the removal of a tumor. It lasted four minutes. The patient’s hands or legs were not held. He did not move or groan, or his countenance change. And when awoke after the operation, he declared he had no recollection of what had occurred. In another case, Hyder Khan, an emaciated man, suffering from mortification of the leg, amputation of the thigh was performed, and no sign of its causing pain was evinced. In a third case, Murali Doss (the operation he underwent being very severe), he moved his body and arms, breathing in gasps, but his countenance underwent little change, and the features expressed no suffering; and on awaking he declared he knew of nothing having been done to him during his sleep. In a fourth case the operation was insignificant. In the three other cases various phenomena were witnessed, which require to be specially pointed out. While the patients did not open their eyes, or utter articulate sounds, or require to be held, there were vague and convulsive movements of the upper limbs, writhing of the body, distortion of the features, giving the face a hideous expression of suppressed agony; the respiration became heaving, with deep sighs. There were, in short, all the signs of intense pain which a dumb person undergoing an operation might be expected to exhibit, *except resistance to the operator*. But in all these cases, without exception, after the operation was completed, the patients expressed no knowledge or recollection of what had occurred, denied having dreamed, and complained of no pain till their attention was directed to the place where the operation had been performed.’*

“On receiving this report the Governor-General, ‘believing,’ in the words of Mr. Halliday, his secretary, ‘that the possibility of rendering the most serious operations painless had been so far established as to render it incumbent on the Government to assist in the inquiry, determined to place Dr. Esdaile for one year in charge of a small experimental hospital in some favourable situation in Calcutta, in order that he might extend his investigations under the inspection of official visitors.’

“The second paper contains the results of the first six

* Report, pp. 2, 3.

months of this experiment. It appears that during that time a series of operations were performed on patients in mesmeric sleep. Dr. Esdaile states that in seven of the cases in which he operated, the patients recovered consciousness before the end of the operation. In all the others their sleep endured until they were intentionally roused after its termination, and they were then unaware of what had been done to them. In many of them, however, there were indications of pain during its continuance. Three of these last-mentioned cases are detailed by Professor O'Shaughnessy, one of the official visitors. They left on his mind, he says, an unfavourable impression. 'But,' he continues, 'I have witnessed so many cases operated upon by Dr. Esdaile since, without the patients shewing the slightest physical or other indication of suffering, either before, during, or immediately after the operation, that I am perfectly satisfied that they did not feel pain any more than the bed they lay upon, or the knife that cut them.'*

"No one can doubt that phenomena like these deserve to be observed, recorded, and arranged: and whether we call by the name of Mesmerism, or by any other name, the science which proposes to do this, is a mere question of nomenclature. Among those who profess this science there may be careless observers, prejudiced recorders, and rash systematisers; their errors and defects may impede the progress of knowledge, but they will not stop it. And we have no doubt that before the end of this century, the wonders which now perplex almost equally those who accept and those who reject modern mesmerism, will be distributed into defined classes, and found subject to ascertained laws; in other words, will become the subjects of a science."

Extract from "Illustrations and Enquiries relating to Mesmerism. By The Rev. S. R. MAITLAND, D.D., F.R.S., F.S.A., some time Librarian to the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and Keeper of the MSS. at Lambeth."

"If the reader has made up his mind to believe or disbelieve, without regard to testimony or evidence, either side of a question which has been discussed with disgraceful bitterness, ignorance, and folly, I am not anxious about his

* Report, Appendix, p. iii.

approbation. If not, I hope he will acquiesce in the propriety of this course; and will also understand and approve the motives which lead me to take the illustrations for this Section exclusively from the reports of cases published in the *Zoist*. That periodical work is the principal organ for the diffusion of information on the subject; and it is countenanced, and contributed to, by the chief patrons and practitioners of mesmerism. It has not yet been seven years in existence, and all the cases to which I refer in this Section have occurred within that period, and in our own country. The reader, therefore, who wishes to verify my transcripts, may do it by reference to one English book; and if he likes to go a step farther, and enquire respecting the genuineness and authenticity of the stories themselves, he may in a good many cases, without much trouble, enquire on the spot, and put his questions to the parties actually concerned. Whatever faults may be justly charged on *The Zoist*, it deserves credit for facilitating such enquiries by careful honesty in giving names, dates, and addresses. I prefix a number to each of the extracts, merely for the sake of reference, and as the order in which they stand is immaterial, they are placed in that of time. I do not know that they require further introduction, except one single observation, which is due to the reader as well as to the authors quoted—namely, that the extracts are given as *illustrations*, and not as *proofs*; and therefore the author is not to be hastily blamed if in any passage which my object leads me to extract, he should seem to take for granted what he does not prove, or to say what may require the context to explain it.”

ILLUSTRATIONS OF CLAIRVOYANCE.

“Mr. T. B. Brindley of Stourbridge, appears from the letter by which they are introduced, to have sent an account of his proceedings to *The Zoist* at the suggestion of Dr. Elliotson and Mr. Townshend. He makes the following statement respecting a patient aged twenty-two, who had ‘suffered from affection of the heart for seven years,’ during which time she had been under the treatment of several medical men whose names are mentioned, and had passed eleven weeks in the Birmingham Hospital, whence she was discharged as incurable. The medical part of the case is not to our purpose; but having detailed it, Mr. Brindley proceeds;—

“‘On the 5th of October, 1843, I magnetized Henrietta Price, of Stourbridge, in the presence of Dr. Dudley, R. L. Freer, Esq., Surgeon, and several others. While in the mesmeric sleep, I

stated to Dr. Dudley that she was then in the clairvoyant state. He immediately said, 'To test her then, send her to my house; and if she tells me what furniture there is in a certain room, I'll believe that mesmerism is not what I now believe it to be,—a gross imposture.' Accordingly, having before satisfied myself by former experiments that she was really clairvoyant, I said to her, 'Henrietta, go to Dr. Dudley's house.' 'I do not like,' said she. 'Oh, but Dr. Dudley wishes you to go.' 'Well, I'll go then.' 'Are you there?' 'Yes.' 'Go into the middle room up stairs, facing the New Road.' 'Well, I'm there.' 'What room is it, a sitting room or a drawing room?' 'Why, neither; it's a bed-room.' 'How do you know?' 'Why, I can see the bed in it, to be sure.' 'What else can you see?' 'A swing glass.' 'Is it a large one?' 'No; a middling size.' 'Has it a drawer in it?' 'Yes.' 'Well, open it and see what is in it.' 'Why, some razors and a small brush with a bone handle.' 'What else can you see in the room?' 'Why, some chairs, but they are not in their right places; the room looks all about; and the carpet is actually turned up all the way at the sides.' 'Are there curtains to the windows?' 'No, I only see a blind.' 'How many windows are there in the room?' 'One, two; only two.' 'What sort of bedsteads are they?' 'French polished.' 'Are they very thick ones?' 'Middling; I have seen thicker.' 'Do they touch the ceiling?' 'Nearly.' 'Well, that will do. Now come back again from Dr. Dudley's to our dining room.' 'Very well.' 'Are you there?' 'Stop a bit.' 'Well?' 'Yes, I am there now.' 'Look into that closet, and tell me who is in there.' 'Why, Dr. Dudley.' 'What is he doing?' 'Tell him to go to market; there is a market-basket by the side of him.' 'I know that. But tell me what he has in his hand?' 'Why its coming winter certainly, and he'll want it.' 'Well, but what is it?' 'Tell him to go and ask Miss —— what it is.' 'Oh, nonsense; tell him what it is yourself.' 'Why, you put gledes in it.' 'What is the name of it?' 'Well, if you are so dull, and must have it, it's a warming-pan.' In every individual instance she was perfectly correct, never failing once to tell all we asked her.

"I then demagnetized her, and mesmerised her sister, Serena Price, who had just entered the room, and who had heard nothing that her sister had said. She also is a clairvoyant subject: so I sent her (mentally) when magnetized to Dr. Dudley's house. When she was there she said, 'Well, here I am; but I do not intend to stand here all night; how am I to get in?' 'Why open the door and go in.' 'Well, I am in; which room shall I go into?' 'Go up stairs.' 'Which room shall I go into?' 'How many are there facing the New Road?' 'Three.' 'Yes, that's right; go into the middle one.' She then accurately described the room, and said the carpet was put down straight, and everything neat and in its place. 'Is there any one in the room then?' 'Yes.' 'Who?' 'A young woman.' 'How is she dressed?' 'Why like a servant should be, to be sure.' 'Oh, she is a servant?' 'Yes.' 'And what is she doing?' 'Why standing at the table, looking at herself in the glass.'

‘What is she doing now?’ ‘Pulling her cap forward on the head.’ ‘And now?’ ‘La’! why viewing herself above a trifle.’ ‘What is she doing now?’ ‘She’s gone into the other room, and is moving some clothes off a chair.’ ‘And now?’ ‘Just gone down stairs.’ ‘Where is she?’ ‘In the kitchen.’ ‘What is she doing?’ ‘Sitting by the fire.’ I then demagnetized her, and Dr. Dudley instantly went home to discover whether all was correct that Serena had told us. Next morning I saw him, and before several gentlemen in a public room, he had the kindness and manliness to inform me that it was perfectly correct in every point, and that he was now a firm believer in the science.’—*Zoist*, No. IV., p. 467. Jan., 1844.

“The next is from *Cases of Mesmeric Clairvoyance and Sympathy of Feeling*, by Dr. Engledue, dated “Southsea, March 4, 1844.” The patient was a young lady on whom he had ‘performed in August, 1842, *without her knowledge*, the operation of dividing the ham-string museles for contraction of the knee-joint.

“‘This patient had been confined to bed for eighteen months, when the following experiment was performed. The house of a relation who lived fourteen miles off was broken into and several articles stolen. This was not communicated to her, but I received a note mentioning the circumstance, not however detailing any of the particulars. When I entranced her, I directed her to go to the house and to ascertain what the family was about. After a few minutes her countenance changed its colour, and she exclaimed, ‘Why —— has been robbed. The door of the house has been cut. The desk has been moved, and all the papers thrown about. (They were carried into the meadow.) He has lost six pounds. (This was quite true; at first it was supposed that only four or five pounds had been taken, but a subsequent investigation proved that there must have been six pounds in the desk.) I know who did it. It was —— and ——; they used a carpenter’s tool. It was done on Monday night, when the wind was so high that they could not be heard. (The robbers broke into an outhouse and obtained a centre-bit, and cut through the door-panel with it.) Why, they gave old Peter something in some food that he should not bark. P—— gave it to him. (The terrier dog, Peter, was dull and stupid for two or three days from the effects of the drug which had been given to him.) Why, how foolish! What are they doing to the doors,—they are putting bits of iron all over them. (The back doors of the house were then being nailed to prevent the application of the centre-bit again.)’

“‘On another occasion, I was told that something important had occurred at the same house. I entranced her and sent her to look. After a little time she said, ‘Why one of —— sheep has been killed. It was killed in the front of the house by two men,—there were four, only two went to the house, and two stood by the lawn gate. They would have killed some pigs, but they heard the great gates. —— is so distressed because he has lost his best sheep.’ After a considerable interval, ‘Well, I declare, if he has not sent down for me to

find out if I can. I hope I shall. And they sent for you; and —— is here to take back word. (Quite true.) Why it is the sheep —— offered £100 for. The idea of their not telling me, as if I should not know! One held the sheep whilst the other killed it with a knife. They took away part of the side: they left part at the barn and part on the lawn. O! they had a lantern and looked it out, for they know about animals, and knew it would distress him so to kill that sheep.' (The sheep was divided and distributed as she said.)'—*Zoist*, No. VI., p. 272. *July*, 1844.

"The next is appended by the Editor to a letter in the same number of *The Zoist*, subscribed 'Edmond Sheppard Symes,' and dated 'Hill-street, Berkeley-square, June 28, 1844.' The object of the letter is to detail some proceedings of Alexis Didier, the French clairvoyant, in a company assembled at the house of Dr. Elliotson on the preceding Monday. Mr. Symes (who may be presumed not to have known, when he wrote his letter, what occurred after the party broke up) having stated that Captain Daniell had examined Alexis, and received satisfactory answers, went on to say, 'The Hon. Edmund Phipps afterwards tried a similar experiment, but I understood Mr. Phipps to say, that he was not equally successful.' The Editor, however, after giving Mr. Symes's letter, adds the following explanation;—

" 'Mr. Atkinson was in the evening with Mr. Phipps, and wrote the following account to Dr. Elliotson, which we are allowed to publish.

" 'The Hon. Edmund Phipps, brother to the Marquis of Normanby, took hold of the hand of Alexis, who described his house in Park-lane in many points with singular correctness; but what was most remarkable, he said, among other things, that he saw a picture of a battle opposite the fire-place in the drawing-room,—he saw men on horseback with spears and helmets, describing the whole very distinctly and correctly, and particularly insisted that there was a figure in the centre of the picture with a crown on the head and a truncheon in his hand leading on the battle, which Mr. Phipps denied, but the boy insisted that he was right, and that if Mr. P. would look when he went home, he would find it, for that he saw it distinctly. I dined with Mr. Phipps that evening, and we examined the picture together, and found that the somnambulist was quite correct, as well as with respect to some curious points described in another picture, which Mr. Phipps had never remarked before, but of too striking and curious a nature to be the effects of a lucky guess. Mr. Phipps was a sceptic, but is now satisfied of the lad's extraordinary powers of clairvoyance.'—*Zoist*, No. VI. p. 293. *July*, 1844."

"The next extract is from a letter addressed to Dr. Elliotson by the Rev. H. B. Sims, dated from 'Parndon, Dec. 20, 1844.'

“ ‘ You asked me for some details of an interview I had with Alexis last year in Paris, where I first became acquainted with him. I was previously an obstinate unbeliever in the clairvoyant wonders of mesmerism ; but having one evening heard some very startling facts related by a person whose veracity I could not question, I resolved to pay Alexis a visit the following morning, that I might, from personal experience, form an opinion on the truth or falsehood of what I had so long disbelieved. I was accompanied by a friend, and we had a private *séance*.’ Alexis was in a very few minutes placed in the mesmeric trance, and having had his eyes carefully bandaged, played at *écarté*, read from a book, &c., &c., with great success and facility. I then sat down by him and asked to have some conversation with him. He took my hand. I asked him if he could tell me where I lived. After a good deal of hesitation he said, ‘ North-east of London ;’ and gave the distance very correctly in leagues. He then said, ‘ There is a railroad which leads to your part of the country. There are two branches to this railroad, and your house is situated on the left branch, and on the right side of that branch.’ He then called for a sheet of paper, and began to draw a map of the part of the country he was describing. He delineated the railway with great correctness, marking the branch which turns off eastward at Stratford, and continuing the other to a point where he said there was a station. He gave a very minute account of the position of this station, answering in all points to that of Roydon ; the river running nearly parallel to it, and the bridge immediately in front : and he also described with much truth the general character and appearance of the surrounding country, and said that the railroad extended only three or four leagues from this point, which is the fact. He then marked on his chart another station, a few miles farther on, and gave exactly the relative distance and position of my house with these two stations. He then said, ‘ Now let us go to your house,’ and proceeded to give a sketch of the road with its various turnings. As he approached the house he was more minute, and described with singular correctness the sudden descent ; the brook about half as wide as the road, the steep ascent on the other side, and the gateway on the right hand of the road. He gave the distance of the house from the gateway very exactly, mentioned a piece of water on the right with ducks upon it (I keep a few wild ducks), and described the position of the stables, &c. The perfect accuracy of the whole of this minute description was truly astonishing.

“ ‘ I then asked him if there was any one living in the house during my absence from home. He said, ‘ Yes ; there was only one person—a gentleman’ (which was the fact) ; and he then proceeded to state his age and describe his character and appearance, as correctly as if he had been well and personally known to him. I should mention that the gentleman who accompanied me was entirely unacquainted with this part of England ; that I had not mentioned to him the subject on which I proposed to question Alexis ; and, in fact, that neither to him nor to any soul in Paris but myself, were

the foregoing particulars known. The *séance* had now lasted nearly an hour; and the mesmeric influence appeared to be on the wane. He began to make mistakes, and I would not suffer him to proceed, being perfectly satisfied with what he had already done, and entertaining a firm conviction, which has been strengthened by subsequent experience, that he really possesses the power he professes to exercise.

“ ‘I am no mesmerist: till I myself witnessed these things no one could be more incredulous on the subject; but I should not be doing justice, either to Alexis or M. Marcillet, who have been unfairly stigmatized as cheats and impostors, if I hesitated to declare my firm belief that the former is endowed with a most wonderful and mysterious faculty, extending far beyond what we have hitherto considered the limits of those powers which have been granted by Providence to the human race.’—*Zoist*, No. VIII. p. 516. Jan. 1845.

“The following is from *A Case showing some of the higher Phenomena of Mesmerism*, by Mr. Jago, dated ‘Bodmin, May 9, 1845,’ addressed to Dr. Elliotson, and published in *The Zoist* for July, 1845. The patient was Miss Harriet Dennis; and Mr. Jago gives the following account of a visit to her on March 7, of that year;—

“ ‘Finding that she was very deep in the mesmeric sleep, I varied my experiment to see what other manifestations could be elicited.

“ ‘A person present was asked to put something in a cup, and without saying what it was to bring it to me in such a way that I might look in it, but that it would be impossible for Miss D. to see what it contained. The cup was brought on a level with my eye. Having looked over the edge of it and seen what was in it, I desired that it might be taken away again; then turning to Miss D., and placing my finger on the organ of language, I asked her, ‘What’s in that cup?’ She instantly, and without any doubtful tone of voice, said ‘Cotton.’ It was a little ball of cotton.

“ ‘Anxious to test this to the utmost, I asked a person to go out of the room and put something in a cup, and bring it to me that I only might see what was in it, as before. This was done, and the cup again placed on the table, which was at the opposite end of the room. Turning to Miss D., I asked her, ‘What’s in it now?’ ‘Wafers.’ This was perfectly true. ‘How many are there?’ ‘Two.’ ‘What colours are they?’ ‘Green and red.’ The last answer is most extraordinary. By candle-light I thought the wafers were a white and a red. My question was repeated, ‘Are you sure that one is green?’ ‘Yes.’ ‘Are you quite sure of this—think?’ ‘Yes,’ she replied rather sharply. Believing that this answer was incorrect, I desired to see the wafers again—one of them was a delicately pale green.

“ ‘Astonished at these results, I requested that the cup should be placed on the table with something in it as before, but that

neither myself nor Miss D. should be told or be allowed to see what it contained. This was done. I then asked, 'What's in that cup now?' She paused as if thinking, and in about a minute said, 'I don't know. 'Do you not really know—think again?' 'No; I do not know.' I now directed a person to bring the cup to me as before, that I alone might see its contents. This was done, and in such a manner that it was impossible for Miss D. to look; in fact, during the whole of this part of the experiment, her head was leaning a little forwards and her eyes were quite closed: care was taken to hold the cup above the level of her forehead each time that it was brought near me, so that had her eyes been wide open she could not have seen what was in it.

"After I had looked at what had been put in the cup, 'I asked her, 'Do you know what it is?' 'Yes, it is a thimble.' This was correct.

"Supposing her by some inscrutable means to be seeing with my eyes, I thought she might be able to describe any object which was known to me. I therefore began to question her about that of which I was certain she could have no previous knowledge.

"Do you know my dressing ease?' 'Yes?'

"How many bottles are there in it?' 'Two.'

"What colours are they?' 'A white and a green.'

"Are you sure that one of them is green?' 'Yes.'

"I had considered that bottle to be blue, and therefore supposed she had given me an incorrect reply, nor did I until the following morning convince myself that it was green. It is that particular shade of green which many find it difficult to distinguish from blue. Her answer was right, and though the question was repeated three or four times she persisted in giving me the same reply.

"How many drawers are there in the ease?' 'One.'

"How many locks are there?' 'Two.'

"What sort of a ease is it?' 'Bound with brass.'

"Had it been before her she could not have given a more correct description.'—*Zoist*, No. X., p. 223. July, 1845.

"The 'Case of Ellen Dawson,' by Mr. W. Hands, of 23, Duke-street, Grosvenor-square, is published in the same number of *The Zoist*, for July, 1845. The patient, a girl, who became subject to epileptic fits at eight years old, and whose life from that time seems to have been chiefly spent under medical treatment. She had, however, so far recovered as to be apprenticed by her friends to the gold-lace business before she came to be Mr. Hands's patient for 'rheumatism and hypertrophy of the left ventricle of the heart.'

"One day Ellen being in the sleep-waking state, I observed her take up some publications which lay on the table and read the titles of them, by which I perceived she was clairvoyant. In order to test this faculty, I filled the tops of some pill-boxes with cotton and tied them over her eyes with a fillet of ribbon, taking care that

the edges of the boxes should rest upon the skin; still she read and distinguished colours as before. I now placed her in a room from which I shut out *every ray of light*, and then presented to her some of the plates in 'Cuvier's Animal Kingdom;' she described the birds and beasts, and told accurately the colour of each, as I proved by going into the light to test her statements. She also distinguished the shades and hues of silks, as indeed did her sister, who is also clairvoyant.'—*Zoist*, No. X., p. 228.

"In my imagination I led her to Berkeley, the locality of my birth, and where Mrs. H. was then on a visit. This was 140 miles from Duke-street. Knowing that Ellen was at the house by her description of it, I said, 'Let us knock at the door and go in.' She assented. 'Now enter the dining-room on the left.' 'Yes.' I then observed her countenance light up, and with a look of delight she exclaimed, 'There is Mrs. H.' I wished to know what she was doing? 'Playing at cards,' was the reply. 'What game?' She could not say. I find she cannot distinguish one card from another. I now requested her to describe what she saw. 'A board,' said she, 'with holes in it, and some pegs.' 'Who is Mrs. H. playing with?' 'Such a nice bonny red-faced old man.' (I knew this to be the host of the house.) 'Who else do you see?' 'Two young ladies and a young gentleman.' These were the daughters and son. I now asked the disposition of each. Ellen *felt* (?) their natural qualities and correctly described them. (It cannot be said we *see* mental character.) After replying to the above inquiries, Ellen suddenly exclaimed, 'There, Mrs. H. has won the game! she is getting up from her chair.' At this time (9 o'clock), as I subsequently learnt, Mrs. H. did rise from her chair, saying to her adversary, 'I have beaten you completely.' I now desired Ellen to accompany me into the churchyard. She there described several tombs which I distinctly recollected. She expressed surprise at the tower being erected at a distance from the church, which is the case. I asked her to enter the latter. She described the monuments, especially those of the Berkeley family, and was vastly amused by the carved dog at the feet of one of the recumbent figures.'—*Ibid.*, p. 229.

"A few days after this Mrs. H. returned by railway from Bristol. One of her boxes was left behind in that city, and she was told it should follow her by the next train, and that it would be in town by eight o'clock. Ellen came to my house whilst the servant was gone to inquire about the box; I put her in the sleep, and asked if she thought it would be lost, or whether it would come by the eight o'clock train? Her reply was, that it would not be lost—that it would not arrive at eight o'clock, but would come by the ten o'clock train; that we should not receive it that night, but at breakfast time on Sunday morning. Such proved to be the case. She also described many of the things in the box, especially a large doll, its dress, the colours, and even told Mrs. H. who it was for; although she had never seen the child, but had only been placed *en rapport* with her at a previous period.'—*Ibid.*, p. 231.

"On another occasion I travelled with Ellen to New York, and

in crossing the seas she described the waves, the storm, the vessels going up and down, at one moment in sight and then disappearing. On entering New York harbour she read several names of vessels, as the 'Nightingale,' 'Victoria,' &c. I knew when she was in the Broadway by her description of the shops having steps to go down to them, the row of trees, the people, their dresses, and the blacks. I wished her to go to No. 115, where my brother was lodging, and asked what she saw in the shop. 'Pianofortes and guitars;' by which I knew it was Dubois's.'—*Ibid.*, p. 232.

" 'I now, at random, said let us leave New York and go into the forests and see the Indians. In *travelling* over the country she became frightened at some animals. I asked what are they like? From the description given I knew they were buffaloes. We proceeded onwards, and presently she came on an Indian village. She described the huts and the dresses, and also what the Indians were doing. The men were smoking curiously-fashioned pipes—the women engaged in household duties with their children at their backs. She further described their singular cradles, and the toys the mothers hang upon them for the amusement of their offspring. Both the sisters afterwards *travelled* over the surface of America, picturing passing events, and describing various places as they *journeyed* along. Had they dwelt in the country for years, they could scarcely have done so more vividly. It may here be well to remark that these children are uneducated, and have never read of these places.'—*Ibid.*

" 'On another occasion, the children being at my house, we agreed to *travel* to Windsor. They described the scenery and places on the journey, and read the different station-boards on the railroad—made remarks on the castle—went through the different rooms, and depicted the furniture and paintings. After this we returned to Slough, and travelled thence to Swindon. They still read the station-boards on the way. At Swindon they noticed the division for the first and second class, and named the viands and articles on the tables.'—*Ibid.*, p. 233.

" 'One striking and beautiful proof of the *bond fide* character of these descriptions, is the fact, that when these children travel to Australia, China, or other remote places in the opposite side of the globe, they are overcome with surprise, and express their astonishment at finding it is night and the inhabitants in bed whilst yet it is broad daylight with us.'—*Ibid.*

" 'The next extract relates to the same clairvoyante, and is taken from the same number of *The Zoist*. But the circumstances are related by the Hon. Miss Boyle, one of the Maids of Honour to the Queen Dowager, in a letter to Dr. Elliotson, dated, Jan. 24th, 1845. The whole document is extremely curious; and but for its length, I should gladly give the whole of it. Miss Boyle having applied to Dr. Elliotson to recommend a mesmerist to attend a lady who was ill, was by him recommended to Mr. Hands, with whom she had been previously unacquainted. Her interview and conversation with

Mr. Hands led to her seeing and being placed *en rapport* with his patient, Ellen Dawson, already mentioned. Their first mental journey was to Normandy, where the clairvoyante (who can scarcely be suspected of falsehood in professing that she had never been in France,) not only described the interior of the church of St. Owen at Rouen, which Miss Boyle was well acquainted with and greatly admired, quite satisfactorily, but minutely detailed the circumstance which had occurred to that lady during a solitary visit which she had paid to the church. After this the dialogue proceeded:—

“‘Now, if you like, we will go to my home in Somersetshire.’ ‘Have you ever been to Bath?’ ‘I can see Bath; it is such a pretty place,—all those houses are so very pretty.’ ‘Now we are at the White Hart Hotel, and there is a carriage to take us by a very beautiful road and along some lanes to my house, and through a little park.’ (Eagerly.) ‘Oh! the dogs, that dear great dog.’ ‘What dogs?’ ‘Why your dog—there he is at the door. (Ellen was in great glee, and quite like a happy child.) He is so glad to see you: how he does jump at your face—how large he is—and how he follows you!’ ‘Yes, Ellen, up to my room, does he not?’ ‘Yes. Oh! what a pretty room it is.’ ‘What do you see in it? Tell me all about it.’ ‘A wardrobe; it stands just as you go into the room: it is a high wardrobe, with clothes in the drawers.’ ‘No, Ellen, there I think you are wrong; I think they were all taken out the morning I came away.’ (However, my maid here made me a sign that Ellen was right.) ‘But there are only clothes in the drawers; I see something red in the closet part of the wardrobe—yes, it is lined with red, and there are colours: and there I can see a tall white figure standing.’ ‘How is the figure standing?’ ‘Like this’—(and here Ellen rose from the chair, and put herself in the exact attitude of the statue in my wardrobe. I was then at a loss to know what she meant by colours: however, when I reached home, I found Ellen was right there—by the statue was a purple, red, yellow, blue and green box, which I had quite forgotten.) ‘What are the colours of my curtains?’ ‘Why the bed curtains are striped green, and so are the window curtains, and I see red chairs. I can’t see all the things at once. There is what looks like a very odd bookcase lined with dark red outside.’ (The case is carved, and shews the lining through the open gothic work.) ‘What books are in it?’ ‘No books at all. Oh! how many things there are on the mantel-shelf.’ ‘But what do you see in my bookcase?’ ‘It is not a bookcase, it opens, and there I see a white figure which looks just like a baby in a night shift, a long loose dress; yet it cannot be a baby’s figure, because there it has a coronet on its head and flat hair.’ ‘Is that then in the bookcase? I wish you would attend.’ (Ellen thinking.) ‘Yes, it is.’ ‘Well, now you are quite wrong.’ ‘Well, let me see again. Oh! no, (eagerly) the baby stands to the right of the bookcase: and now I can see a sort of bust of a young lady.’ ‘How is her hair done?’ ‘Flat: oh no, that’s the figure to the right,—it’s done in thick

bushy curls off the forehead: she has a glove on, and there is gold and colours close by.' Ellen was right; the baby figure, as she called it, is even with and on the right of the carved ease, and represents St. Margaret in a long loose robe fastened at the throat, very much like a child's night-gown; she has a coronet on her head; her hair is flat. The oak case contains a bust of my only sister, exactly as Ellen described it; the colours are letters on a gold ground, and my sister's shield emblazoned with the Boyle and Courtenay arms, red, white and yellow.'—*Zoist*, No. X., p. 239.

" 'We then went to the cottages in the village. She there described a lunatic chained and an epileptic patient, and told me in detail how to cure each, and in what manner I should get the lunatic sufficiently tranquil to be mesmerised. She also told me of a conversation I had eleven years ago in the church of Santo Spirito at Florence; described the person I was there with, and who has never been in England, and what objects (some of which were peculiar, and which she was a long time making out or seeing, as she told me) were around us at the time. Strange, passing strange, I admit; nevertheless, strictly true, I most solemnly declare.'—*Ibid.*, p. 240.

"The next extract is from a ease reported to Dr. Elliotson by William Topham, Esq., barrister-at-law, in a letter, dated May 31, 1847, relating to a lad of about eighteen years of age, named Thomas Horner, whom he began to mesmerise for epilepsy in the year 1843. Mr. Topham says:—

" 'After five or six weeks' mesmerism he began spontaneously to exhibit instances of clairvoyance. The first occasion was on the 11th of September. It was in the dusk of the evening; so that the room where he was mesmerised was nearly dark. My previous mode of mesmerising him had been by pointing at his eyes, but on this occasion I began by making passes over the top of his head, and continued them after he was in the sleep. In the course of five or six minutes after the sleep was induced, he suddenly exclaimed that he could see into the room above us (the drawing-room). I said, 'Your eyes are closed; how can you see?' And he replied, 'I don't see with my eyes! I see from the top of my head; all the top of my head seems open!' He then accurately described the position of different articles in the room above us, which I myself had never noticed before, and he having only entered the room once in his life, when he came for a couple of minutes to speak to me, a month previously. He also named two persons, out of a large party in the house, as being in the room; told me accurately where each was sitting, and how occupied. I inquired of him if he saw any light, knowing that it was earlier than the usual time of the lights being taken up to that room; he answered, that there was only a very small candle on the table, near the person (naming him) who was reading. I found everything as Horner had described; a small taper having been used as a temporary light.

" 'He exhibited many other instances of clairvoyance upon different occasions, of which I will give one or two more.

“‘I have put on a shooting-jacket, in which were eight or ten pockets; I have put various articles into each pocket, of a description very unlikely to be mixed together; and then, with the pockets closed and the jacket buttoned up to my throat, I would proceed to the dark room where Horner was, and standing a couple of yards before him, he would tell me truly the several articles in the several pockets, describing the situation of each article within it. Occasionally a short time after he had rightly named some one article as being in a certain pocket, I have secretly removed it to another; but he constantly perceived the change and described it, although my hand was always closed over the thing which I was removing, and the persons who were standing nearer to me than Horner sat could detect nothing that I did.

“‘I once requested a friend, out of Horner’s hearing, to go up stairs into the room above us, and hold up the window-curtain, at a time when Horner was describing to me what a large party there were doing, and, apparently, much amused at their proceedings. Suddenly he exclaimed, ‘Why there’s Mr. De Gex just come into the room!’ I said, ‘Watch him, and tell me what he does.’ He then exclaimed, ‘Oh, what a curious thing for him to do; he is standing with his hand hold of your father’s shoulder! Yes, there he stands, still! What a curious thing! Now, he has left him, and is going out of the room again!’ In a few moments Mr. De Gex re-entered the room where we were, when I repeated Horner’s statement. He said that it was perfectly true, and that he had changed the manner of testing Horner’s clairvoyance in order to satisfy himself.’*—*Zoist*, No. XVIII., p. 127.

“So far as concerns the marvellous, it might perhaps be difficult to settle the order of precedence among some of the cases reported in *The Zoist*; but certainly that one to which the following extract refers is not the least remarkable. The patient was Frances Gorman, a young woman residing with her mother, at No. 12, Union-place, Harper-street, New Kent-road.” “Mr. Hands, her mesmerist, goes on to say:—

“‘I will now proceed to relate some of Frances’s feats in clairvoyance. One day, during her recovery, Mrs. Gorman (who, by the by, is like Ellen Dawson’s mother styled a fatal *dreamer*, that is, one of those whose dreams are said always to come true) accompanied her daughter, and told me her object was to discover if possible where a certain deed was belonging to her son, I having on a former occasion mentioned to her the powers some have in the mesmeric sleep. Her son had married a woman of some property, who was of a strange temper, and very shortly after her marriage had quarrelled with her husband’s friends, and would never hold any communication with them. This woman had secreted the lease of the house, and her husband, who wanted it in order to consult his lawyer respecting

* “Mr. De Gex also is a barrister, and is a Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge.—*Note by Dr. Elliottson.*”

some alterations, demanded the deed; but the wife would never give it up, and even told him she had lost it, and finally that she had burnt it. He being a quiet, peaceable man, put up with this; but frequently, during his wife's absence from home, would hunt in all the drawers and boxes, yet notwithstanding all his pains, he could never meet with the document, and gave it up as lost. He sometimes complained to his mother stealthily (for his wife used to threaten him with dire vengeance if he ever had any intercourse with his friends) of the disadvantages he laboured under in consequence of the loss of the deed: and this induced Mrs. Gorman to try if her daughter could discover where it was concealed. Having sent Frances to sleep, I requested her to go to her brother's residence, Paragon Mews, New Kent-road. Presently she exclaimed, 'Here is the house, but she won't let us in you know, for she never speaks to us, and would kill me if I entered.' It must be mentioned that in her sleep-waking she always mistook me for a friend named Clara. I said, 'Never mind, let us knock at the door.' Frances cried out, 'There she is, sitting down; she will see us.' I now quieted her fears, and coaxed her to pass by her sister-in-law, through the sitting-room, and in imagination we entered the bed-room. After resting a few seconds, as if in contemplating something, she suddenly exclaimed, 'I see it in that large black box under the bed; there are three boxes; it is the middle one, which is lined with blue-spotted paper.' I said, 'Let us pull it out and look in it.' 'Oh,' she observed, 'how hard it is to come out: (the bed rested on it, I afterwards learnt;) there it is in that paper under the books on the left-hand side;' and added, 'how cunning; she thought no one would ever suspect it was there.' I told her to look at the lease, and she put out her hand as though to take hold of it, saying, 'I can see John Shepperd, Esq., to ———. I cannot make out the new word. Oh, now I see, M-c-ss-rs. Thos. and Wm. Grenstone, Lease, Nov. 1834.' I asked if she could read anything inside. She replied, 'I can see, *house and stables*;' and she read some more which is immaterial. She noticed in the room a new chest of drawers and many other things, and said she wondered her brother had never mentioned them. I awoke her, and they left me. I should state that Frances had never been into the house but once, and that was shortly after her brother's marriage, and then she only entered the front room.

" 'I was not at all surprized, when next I saw them, to hear that all Frances had stated was correct. I have seen long paragraphs read many times by different patients, out of the room in which they were asleep. Mrs. Gorman told me she mentioned to her son that his sister in her sleep had seen where the deed was, at which he merely laughed, and said that he had looked in all the boxes many times and it was not there; but when she mentioned the chest of drawers and the other things, he began to stare and wonder, and said at all events he would go and look again, and the next day persuaded his wife to call on a friend at a distance. When she was gone, he opened the box, and found the deed exactly in the position as related.'—*Zoist*, No. XX., p. 334.

“Dr. Ashburner states that on the 12th Feb., 1848, Major Buckley brought to his house, ‘at half-past eight o’clock in the evening, two young women who had arrived at Paddington, about three hours before, from Cheltenham.’ He adds, that he had previously corresponded with the Major on their cases, and it had been agreed that on the evening of their arrival no one should be present but the Major and himself;—

“ ‘We assembled in my little library. I had provided myself with a dozen walnut-shells, bought at Grange’s in Piccadilly, containing carraway comfits, and as I thought a motto each, and two ounces of hazle nut-shells, containing carraway comfits and printed mottos. These were in two packets of an ounce each, and had been purchased by me about two hours before, at Lawrence’s, in Oxford-street, at the corner of Marylebone-lane. One of the young women was seated at either side of the fire place, Major Buckley placed himself at the apex of a triangle, of which they formed the basal angles. He made a few slow passes from his forehead to the pit of his stomach, on his own person. The girls said, after he had made eight or ten of these passes, ‘that they were sufficient.’ They saw a blue light upon him; and A. B., having taken up one of the nut-shells provided by me, placed it upon the chimney-piece above her head. E. L. then did the same thing with one of the nut-shells allotted to her. I was fully aware of the objections of sceptics, that a possibility existed of changing these shells by sleight of hand; I watched the proceedings anxiously and accurately, to avoid the possibility of being deceived.’—*Zoist*, No. XXI., p. 100, *April*, 1848.

“By the details which follow, and which are too long to allow of their being extraeted, we are informed that, with very few and trifling mistakes, the young women read the mottos enclosed in the shells. In consequence of the agreement already mentioned, no stranger was invited to this first trial; but Mr. Arnott, ‘who had come on professional business, and with no view of witnessing these phenomena,’ was in the room during a part of the time. The meeting was adjourned to the 15th of February. On that day Mr. Ashurst Majendie was present. On that day the experiments were repeated in the presenece of Mr. and Mrs. Guteh; and

“On Thursday, 24th February, Lord Adare (now Earl of Dunraven) came by appointment at half-past three to witness the clairvoyance of these young women. Major Buckley having made the passes down his own face, the girls said they saw a blue light on his forehead and cheeks. They were nervous at the presence of Lord Adare, and it was a long time before either of them felt able to read. A. B. trembled and could not read at all. E. L. at last said she could see the last line of the motto in her nut, and she read thus,—

“He seeks for thorns and finds his share.”

I had written a for his, and when I read out before the nut was cracked, she corrected me. Lord Adare opened the shell and read,—

“Man blindly follows grief and care :
He seeks for thorns and finds his share.”

The last line was just as E. L. had seen it before the shell was opened.

“In conversing with Dr. Elliotson on the subject of these experiments, he suggested to me that notwithstanding the conviction I had of the nut-shells being identical with those I had bought myself, there might be a possibility of some jugglery. It was *possible* that each nut might be changed for one the motto of which was well known. It was not right to be content with probabilities.

“Lord Adare presented a nut, the motto of which had been previously taken out and marked. E. L. said there was something in that nut-shell which gave her a severe head-ache. She was sure it was marked, and the very suspicion of her being guilty of fraud made her feel very ill. She began to read,—

“Thy charms, my love can make.”

but could not proceed. She went away, and both girls passed a restless night, so keenly hurt were they from having failed, and from having been thought capable of trick and deceit. The next day, they came again, and Lord Adare, Major Buckley, and I were the only persons present. The first part of the motto read yesterday proved to be correct. I had procured some nuts at M. Cœuret’s in Drury Lane, and had taken out the mottos, cut them carefully with seissors so that I should know them again, and had moreover written my initials on each slip of paper before I refolded and replaced it in the nut-shell. I ought to observe that I put back the sugar-plums and closed the shells so carefully with chocolate, I am certain no person could detect, the day after, that they had been opened. The number I treated in this manner prevented my remembering the lines of the mottos, so that the phenomena could not be dependent on thought-reading. E. L. laboured under a head-ache, and said she was too confused, she feared, to read accurately. At last she said, ‘I see J. A. at one end of the motto written in ink—that’s a marked nut I know;’ then she proceeded,—

“Love not governed by sense or reason
Is like a chance bird out of season.”

Lord Adare broke the shell, and on examining the paper found the letters J. A. I recognized my marks. The words printed were,—

“Love not guided still by reason,
Is the chance bird of a season.”

So that the clairvoyante had been confused in her reading.

“A. B. then tried to read a marked nut,—

“Fair maiden, hear my loving vow.”

She remarked that the sugar-plums were all white, instead of being of several colours. She was quite correct. The illness of the clair-

voyantes prevented our going on with the experiments.'—*Ibid.* p. 105.

"Dr. Elliotson says, 'In the 8th and 11th numbers of *The Zoist* such examples of the clairvoyance of Alexis Didier were given, as compelled me, with all my prejudices, to be satisfied of his possessing the faculty at times.' He adds, 'I received the following account from M. Marcillet ;'—

"On May 17, 1847, Alexis and myself went to the apartments of Lord Frederick Fitzclarence, at the hotel Brighton, Rue Rivoli, and the trials of Alexis's clairvoyance were begun in the presence of Lord Normanby, the English ambassador, who, like Lord Frederick, had no belief in mesmerism.

"Can you describe my country house in England?" said the ambassador to Alexis, who had been sent into sleeping-waking. After reflecting a few minutes, Alexis replied, that it was on a height. Then, having detailed its situation and all the particulars of the grounds, he accurately described the furniture of the house, and finished by saying, that certain windows looked out upon the sea. So unexpected a description astonished the ambassador.

"A young and handsome lady, encouraged by the lucidity of Alexis, put some questions to him. He told her her name and her rank; 'you are a *dame d'honneur* of Queen Victoria,' added he; and it was true.

"Lord Normanby took up one of Lord Frederick's books, and, having stated the number of a page, Alexis read a sentence in it, though the book was not out of Lord Normanby's hands. This experiment was repeated several times and always with the same success.

"Lord Frederick had, up to this moment, been a mere spectator: but now broke silence, took the hand of Alexis, and, with his characteristic kindness of manner, asked the following question,—

"Can you tell me how I was employed the day before yesterday with that gentleman?" pointing to one of the company.

"I see you both," replied Alexis, 'going to the Rue Lazare in a carriage: there you take the train and travel to Versailles; you then get into another carriage, which conveys you to St. Cyr. You visit the military school, and it was the other gentleman who proposed this excursion, he having been educated there.'

"All this is admirable, Alexis," exclaimed his lordship. 'Go on, Alexis.'

"You return to Versailles; I see you both enter a pastry-cook's. Your companion eats three little cakes: you take something else.'

"Lord Frederick, perfectly astonished, said, before Alexis had time to think, 'You are right; I ate a small piece of bread.'

"You next take the train again and return to Paris. However, let us thoroughly understand each other. You started by the railroad on the right bank, but you returned by that on the left.'

"The latter circumstance astonished his lordship so much, that he not only congratulated us before the whole party, but offered us

his high patronage on every occasion.'—*Zoist*, No. XXIV., p. 417. Jan. 1849.

"Dr. Elliotson immediately proceeds to say:—

" 'Soon after M. Mareillet had sent me word of these wonders, a friend of mine—Mr. Bushe, son of the late Chief Justice of Ireland, and intimate with Lord Frederick, called upon me, and offered to apply to his lordship respecting the truth. His lordship immediately desired his secretary to write me word that he was at that moment too busy to write to me himself, but that, if I would procure a detailed account, he will peruse it, and, if he found it accurate, certify to its truth. I applied repeatedly to M. Mareillet, who is the most unmethodical and dilatory man in the world, and it was but lately that I procured from him the statement which I have translated. I transmitted the original to Lord Frederick by means of our common friend, and the following was his lordship's answer,—

" 'Portsmouth, Nov. 15, 1848.

" 'My dear Bushe,—I have read the statement you sent me relative to the *séance* that was held at my apartments when in Paris, in 1847, in mesmerism. It is quite correct in every particular; indeed nothing could be much more extraordinary than the whole thing was in every respect.

" 'I hope I shall see Dr. Elliotson here, as he is a great friend of our first physician here—Dr. Engledue, whose acquaintance I have lately had the good fortune to make. Come down, my dear Bushe, and see your old friend.

" 'FRED. FITZCLARENCE.

" 'I return the letter.'

"With regard to a subsequent interview between Lord Normanby and Alexis, Dr. Elliotson states that he had not had the same means of verifying M. Mareillet's account of it, but that Lord Frederick's testimony respecting M. Mareillet's accuracy, so far as he was concerned on the first occasion, removes all doubt from his mind as to his having truly reported what took place at the second.

" 'Last Wednesday, the 24th instant, your ambassador, Lord Normanby, desired to see us a second time, and was again astonished. 'In this box,' said he to Alexis, 'I have placed something, can you tell me what it is?' 'It is a bracelet with a portrait; the likeness is of Queen Victoria!!!' 'That is astounding; you lately described my English country house to me; I have another, can you see it?' 'Perfectly well. It is not in England. It is in a warmer climate. I will stand at the window. I see a great city situated a league off; a little river flows near your garden. The city that I see is Florence! You have lived in this city also, for I see your house also; it is in the *Place* opposite a large church. You had, likewise, a terrace. You had your portrait taken in this city.' 'Yes.' 'This portrait is placed in the saloon of your country house!' 'This is overpowering,' said the ambassador.'—*Ibid*.

"A story relative to the recovery of a lost brooch, which appeared in the *Belle Assemblée* for February, 1849, is given

more fully in the *The Zoist* for the month of April following, in a letter from Mr. Barth, a mesmerist, of No. 7, Eversholt-street, Camden-town, to Dr. Elliotson. It appears that a lady unknown to him, and who speaks of him as 'a perfect stranger' whom she had never seen, applied to him, and was by him introduced to Mr. J. Hands and Ellen Dawson, who have been already mentioned, and an appointment was made for Saturday, the 11th of November, 1847; the discovery that the brooch was missing having only been made at the beginning of that month. Accordingly, on that day, accompanied by a female friend and Mr. Barth, the lady attended, and she tells us that after the necessary preliminaries of putting the patient to sleep, &c., Mr. Barth

" 'Asked her if she would tell what I came to see her about: in a few minutes she answered, 'about a loss—about something she has lost.' She then knelt down by my side, when I took hold of her hands and commenced telling my grievance to her. I began by saying she was right,—I had lost something of great value that I wanted her to tell me about. She first said money, to which I replied, 'No.' Then she said property, to which I assented. Mr. Barth then proposed that she should go (ideally of course) to my house, to the place from where the missing article was taken, and thus discover what I had lost, and how it had disappeared. I told her then where my residence was; she said she did not know the place, but we told her what route to take, and she soon reached the house—described the exterior, so that I knew she was right, and then went into my bed-room, where she gave a very minute account of the furniture. I then directed her attention to the place from where the article had been taken, and she soon found out what I had lost. She first said jewellery; and when I asked her what kind, she answered, a brooch. I inquired then what it was like; to which she gave a wonderfully accurate answer: she said it looked like *amber* surrounded with white. She then said it was some little time since I had lost it, that it was very old, and had been a long time in the family. She then told me I had been out of town, which I was during the month of September. Finding her account and description so very correct in every particular, she was now told to keep her eye upon the brooch and see what became of it. She then described, in words not to be mistaken, the person who had taken it out of its accustomed place: in fact, no artist could have painted a more perfect resemblance; and it was a servant whom I never suspected. She had left my service about a month before I discovered my loss. However, Ellen was very positive in her description of the person who took it, and said the brooch was sold for a very small sum of money, nothing at all like its value. She then said she saw a shop window, that the brooch was in a queer place like a cellar with lots of other property—silver spoons and other things; but a cloud came and she could see no more. I must not omit one very

remarkable circumstance in her account; she said the person who took it had the ease in which it was kept with diamonds in it, at home in her clothes trunk. At first, I could not think what this was, but soon remembered that there two diamond chains fastened to a small diamond ring, separate from the brooch, but for the purpose of attaching to it, and wearing as a locket. Having thus obtained all the information she could give me upon the subject, I inquired what I was to do to recover it, and she then gave me most distinct instructions as to what course I was to take, saying that she thought, by following her directions, I should recover it.

“‘I have now only to say that her prophetic vision was as correct as her account of the past had been, and that shortly after I took the steps she recommended, my brooch was in my possession. It was returned to me on Thursday, Nov. 16th. She was perfectly *correct* as to *who* had taken it; and my astonishment may, perhaps, be conceived, when first the case was brought to me with the diamond chains and ring exactly as she had said, and then a duplicate or pawnbroker’s ticket for the brooch, which, instead of having been sold, was pawned for a mere trifle.’—*Zoist*, No. XXV., p. 96, April, 1849.

“‘It is not to our purpose to follow out the details which are given of the means by which the brooch was regained; but it may be proper to add the remark which Mr. Barth has annexed to the story.

“‘Many persons who have been favoured by an interview with Ellen have supposed her faculty to be merely ‘thought-reading’—a faculty possessed generally by good clairvoyants, and no less wonderful than clairvoyance. In this case much was told by Ellen which was acknowledged to be the truth by Mrs. M —, but is not detailed in her statement, and which could not be thought-reading. Ellen saw the past and the present as relating to the case, and also foresaw the future.’—*Ibid.*, p. 98.

“‘One of the most important events, however, in the history of British Mesmerism, is the formation of a ‘Bristol Mesmeric Institution,’ which recently took place, and is reported in *The Zoist* for July 1849. Lord Ducie presided; and in the course of his opening speech his lordship, after detailing the benefit which he had received from mesmerism under his sufferings from rheumatic gout, went on to say;—

“‘In the highest departments or phenomena of mesmerism he for a long time was a disbeliever, and could not bring himself to believe in the power of reading with the eyes bandaged or of mental travelling; at length, however, he was convinced of the truth of those powers, and that, too, in so curious and unexpected a way that there could have been no possibility of deception. It happened that he had to call upon a surgeon on business, and when he was there the surgeon said to him, ‘You have never seen my little clairvoyant.’

He replied that he never had, and should like to see her very much. He was invited to call the next day, but upon his replying that he should be obliged to leave town that evening, he said, 'Well, you can come in at once; I am obliged to go out, but I will ring the bell for her and put her to sleep, and you can ask her any questions you please.' He (Lord Ducie) accordingly went in; he had never been in the house in his life before, and the girl could have known nothing of him. The bell was rung, the clairvoyante appeared; the surgeon, without a word passing, put her to sleep, and then he put on his hat and left the room. He (Lord Ducie) had before seen something of mesmerism, and he sat by her, took her hand, and asked her if she felt able to travel. She replied, 'Yes;' and he asked her if she had ever been in Gloucestershire, to which she answered that she had not, but should very much like to go there, as she had not been in the country for six years: she was a girl of about 17 years old. He told her that she should go with him, for he wanted her to see his farm. They travelled (mentally) by the railroad very comfortably together, and then (in imagination) got into a fly and proceeded to his house. He asked her what she saw; and she replied, 'I see an iron gate and a curious old house.' He asked her, 'How do you get to it?' She replied, 'By this gravel walk:' which was quite correct. He asked her how they went into it, and she replied 'I see a porch, a curious old porch.' It was probably known to many that his house, which was a curious old Elizabethan building, was entered by a porch as she had described. He asked her what she saw on the porch, and she replied, truly, that it was covered with flowers. He then said, 'Now we will turn in at our right hand; what do you see in that room?' She answered with great accuracy, 'I see a bookcase and a picture on each side of it.' He told her to turn her back to the bookcase, and say what she saw on the other side; and she said, 'I see something shining like that which soldiers wear.' She also described some old muskets and warlike implements which were hanging up in the hall; and upon his asking her how they were fastened up (meaning by what means they were secured), she mistook his question, but replied, 'The muskets are fastened up in threes,' which was the case. He then asked of what substance the floors were; and she said, 'Of black and white squares;' which was correct. He then took her to another apartment, and she very minutely described the ascent to it as being by four steps. He (Lord Ducie) told her to enter by the right door, and say what she saw there. She said, 'There is a painting on each side of the fireplace.' Upon his asking her if she saw anything particular in the fireplace, she replied, 'Yes, it is carved up to the ceiling,' which was quite correct, for it was a curious old Elizabethan fireplace. There was at Tortworth-court a singular old chesnut-tree, and he told her that he wished her to see a favorite tree, and asked her to accompany him. He tried to deceive her by saying, 'Let us walk close up to it;' but she replied, 'We cannot, for there are railings round it.' He said, 'Yes, wooden railings;' to which she answered, 'No, they are of iron,' which was

the case. He asked, 'What tree is it?' and she replied that she had been so little in the country that she could not tell; but upon his asking her to describe the leaf, she said, 'It is a leaf as dark as the geranium leaf; large, long, and jagged at the edges.' He (Lord Ducie) apprehended that no one could describe more accurately than that the leaf of the Spanish chesnut.'—*Zoist*, No. XXVI., p. 154. July, 1849.

"I must add an extract from one other case, related by one of the gentlemen who took part in the formation of the Bristol Mesmerie Institute. It is given in the same number of *The Zoist* among the 'mesmerie cures,' by Mr. William Hazard, 17, Avon Creseent, Hotwells, Bristol. After detailing the case of Ann Bateman, aged twenty-five, who was suffering from dropsy and nervous headaches, he adds;—

" 'She resided next door to a lady whom I was attending for ophthalmia. After mesmerising the lady, I sent for her, and put her to sleep in an easy chair. The lady, Mrs. C., was the wife of the commander of a large ship, which had recently left Bristol with emigrants for New Orleans, on the 9th of November, 1848. Mrs. C. said, 'Do ask Ann if she can tell you where Capt. C. is now.' I excited Concentrativeness, Ideality, Individuality and Locality, and then put the questions. She said yes she could, but he was a great way from here; and she would tell me in five minutes. This was in the evening of the 17th of November. At the expiration of the five minutes she spoke. She said, 'Ah! there's the ship; but oh! how dark; how she tumbles; I shall be sick, (at the same time she was in that kind of unsteady motion so usual to persons unaccustomed to the sea;) how the wind roars, and the sea so high and black; it's dreadful!' 'Do you see Capt. C?' 'Yes, there he is on a high deck, calling to the men; now there's an Irish woman at the cabin door, asking for medicine; others saying they would all be drowned; now there's Capt. C. leaning over a rail, saying, Go down my good women, there's no danger.' Now she said, 'There's such a noise down stairs; there's a man, he looks like a parson or a quaker, with a great flat hat on, talking to the people; now he has put a large tin horn to his ear, and is lifting up his hand.' This and much more was said by her. I let her remain calm after dispelling the influence of the excited organs for ten minutes. She awoke, was unconscious of having spoken, and said she had had a nice sleep.

" 'The test of the foregoing is as follows. Mrs. C. wrote to her husband at New Orleans by the mail packet of the following month, December, wishing to know what kind of passage he had, and particularly requesting him to state the weather and general transactions of the night of the 17th of November, without stating her reason for so doing. Mrs. C. received an answer to this letter on the 6th of February, 1849; Capt. C. observing that the mail for January had unfortunately left before he could write. In this letter, which I have

seen, he says that on the morning of the 17th of November* to that on the 18th it was blowing a gale of wind, but quite fair for them; they were to the westward of Madeira; that there was a very heavy sea rolling, and the ship laboured a great deal; the emigrants were very sick and frightened, and the most troublesome person was an itinerant *deaf* preacher, who was constantly exhorting them much to their annoyance; that he was on the poop deck the whole of the night; and never did the ship run such a distance as she did in the twenty-four hours of the 17th and 18th of November, 1848.

“ ‘Mrs. C. has since seen her husband at Liverpool, and has told me that everything stated by the somnambulist had been fully corroborated by him.’ ”—*Ibid*, p. 178.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF VOLITION.

“An illustration of the mastered and overpowered will may be taken from the ease of a clairvoyante patient recorded by Mr. Townshend;—

“ ‘When urged to look at anything she expressed the greatest repugnance to do so; and it was only at the reiterated *command* of the mesmeriser that she aroused herself to the necessary effort. At those times her whole deportment was that of a person who wished to rest, yet who, by some external force, was *compelled* into exertion. No exorcised spirit could have done its work more grudgingly; and, like the enchantress evoked by Odin, she continually entreated to be left to repose.’ ”—*Facts in Mesmerism*, p. 46.

“Something very similar to this may be found in the ease of a young lady, reported by Dr. Ashburner in *The Zoist*. While she was his patient in June, 1844,

“ ‘She responded to the excitation of the phrenological organs, and felt obliged to obey the *will* of the mesmeriser up to the point of following him about the room; but if she were commanded to do anything very repulsive to her feelings, she became awake instantly and suddenly.’ ”—*Zoist*, No. XIII., p. 132.

“ ‘I proposed one morning to exercise the *will* in silently commanding this young lady to come to me at the distance of twenty-four feet. Her mother was present, and there was a playful recommendation to resist the power of my *will*. I was determined that she should obey, and I spoke out my determination, which put the young lady upon her mettle, and she was at first equally resolute that she would not obey. I continued to *will* for about six minutes, concentrating all my ideas on the resolution. At last, I saw her covered with a violet-coloured halo. She burst into tears, and very

* Printed December in the *Zoist*, but subsequently corrected in the Errata of No. XXVIII.

unwillingly yielded her obedience, not without continuing to resist at every step she took in advancing towards me.'—*Ibid.*

"On the other hand, an illustration of the lost, or merged, will may perhaps be found in the Report of the performances of Alexis at Dr. Elliotson's;—

" 'He seemed modest, unassuming, like any other lad of that age. He did not seem to relish being interrupted by Marcillet's summons to sit down, and resolutely persisted in taking his time, and finishing the prints in *Punch*. I mention this as it contrasts so completely with his spaniel-like affection for his mesmeriser, when entranced, when he did nothing but write over a sheet of paper, now by me,—“Marcillet, Marcillet, Marcillet.” He seemed heart and soul occupied by him. When unmesmerised, Marcillet laments that he is obstinate, and will not follow good advice.'—*Zoist*, No. VIII., p. 486.

" 'Alexis having seated himself in a large easy chair, M. Marcillet stood in front of him, and after fixing his eyes upon him for about four minutes the magnetic sleep was produced. During this operation there were convulsive motions of the limbs and muscles of the face, and every now and then Alexis turned his eyes towards the operator, as it seemed to me, with an expression of pain, and almost entreaty to desist. The convulsive motions subsided after a few passes by the operator, and then the phenomena of catalepsy were shown.'—*Ibid*, p. 496.

"The case of Miss Aglionby, as we find it related by herself, while it seems in some degree to combine the characteristics of both the foregoing cases, exhibits a singular difference; and the perfect consciousness which she retained, renders it, I presume, very singular and worthy of notice. Her letter to Dr. Elliotson is dated the 23rd of June, 1848; and, after stating that she had been first mesmerised by Mr. Nixon, her medical attendant, on the 7th of that month, she goes on to say;—

" 'After being thrown into my usual state, Mr. Nixon retreated a few steps from me, when I felt a strange sensation of uneasiness, and my arms stretched out, pointing whichever way Mr. Nixon moved; my mind all the while remaining active and clear, though the power to control my movements was entirely gone and I felt drawn irresistibly as the needle by the magnet. After a time my uneasiness increased, and I rose and followed the movements of my mesmeriser, my eyes still being closely shut.'—*Zoist*, No. XXIII., p. 238.

"With relation to the next day, Miss Aglionby says;—

" 'I was speedily under the mesmeric influence, my body and senses subdued and under control, but my thoughts as usual free

and clear . . . This evening I followed my mesmeriser unerringly through the room with closed eyes, and answered correctly to pressure over several of the organs of the head. When an organ was touched over, I felt irresistibly impelled to follow the indication, though perfectly aware of what I was doing: for instance, Mr. Nixon, meaning to touch Firmness, happened to press Veneration, and I fell on my kness, my thoughts turning to God and heaven. When Firmness was really touched, I was compelled to draw myself up to my full height, and aspire as it were to reach the very ceiling. When Benevolence is pressed, I feel unutterably calm and happy. I cannot express any of my emotions in words, unless the organ of Language is excited, and then my tongue is loosened, and I speak, knowing what I say, though saying it entirely from impulse. Imitation makes me follow most ludicrously Mr. Nixon's words and gestures.'—*Zoist*, No. XXIII., p. 239.

"To explain this more fully Miss Aglionby, in a letter dated the 12th of July, says, 'When I copied Mr. Nixon's gestures during the trance, I felt *impelled* to act as he was acting, but I was not aware, until told afterwards, that I was imitating him. For instance, when he raised his arm, I felt an *irresistible impulse* to raise mine, but I did not know that he was doing so at the same time.'

"The following extracts are taken from accounts of the 21st, 25th, and 28th of July;—

" 'I obeyed my mesmeriser's will (of course only mentally expressed) with great precision. For instance, I walked across the room and sat down on the seat he willed, and then rose up and closed a desk that was on the table. I always preserve my senses, but feel a wish or rather an impulse to perform what he silently wills.'—*Ibid.*, p. 243.

" 'Without having Imitation excited, I followed my mesmeriser's attitudes when he did not intend me to do so. He left me in the middle of the room, standing and powerless to follow him, though wishing it, so strongly that the tears streamed down my cheeks with distress at my inability.'—*Ibid.*, p. 244.

" 'I obeyed Mr. Nixon's mental will accurately. When he *wills* me to perform any particular action, I do not know that he *wills* it, but I merely felt a very strong inclination, or rather impulse, to do it.'—*Ibid.*, p. 245.

"In connexion with this subject there are some other points which should be just briefly mentioned.

"One of these is the *attachment* or *attraction* which the patient manifests towards the mesmeriser. Speaking on this subject, Dr. Elliotson says;—

" 'Patients, in whom the phenomena takes place and who can talk, describe the sensation from the mesmeriser as exceedingly plea-

sant, and that from others as exceedingly unpleasant. Generally the former is described as warm, and the latter as cold. One of my patients, however, describes the sensation from others than the mesmeriser as a sort of roughness: "very disagreeable,—she can hardly tell what: not cold, but a sort of roughness." The distress occasioned by the contact of others, in cases where this attraction and repulsion happen, is often extreme: and for want of ascertaining whether the attraction and repulsion exists, great temporary disturbance, convulsions and even delirium, have often been produced by strangers touching the patient. I have a patient in whom the momentary touch of even a sister or her father, on whom she doats, agonizes her and causes her to cry out, "cruel, cruel." In her, proximity of another within two yards, even behind her, gradually induces this sensation of coldness, till it can be borne no longer; and, when two others besides the mesmeriser are in the room at even a greater distance, the result is the same, and the effect increases according to the number present: and yet she, being unconscious of the presence of any one but the mesmeriser, has no idea of the cause of the sensation and blames him for it. Not only will mischief thus arise in these cases, but from the mere departure of the mesmeriser. I have a patient who dashes violently after me if I attempt to go to another part of the room: another holds one or both of my hands all the time I am with her, and cannot be prevailed upon to let me retire a quarter of a yard from her: two others who have no power to rise, but become gradually more and more agitated if I sit at a little distance from them, and one had fits whenever I retired from her in the early stage of my mesmeric knowledge. But the latter and another, who is a youth of nineteen, grasp my hand firmly to prevent my leaving them, and he so firmly as often to pain me.—*Zoist*, No. V., p. 51.

"In a more recent number of the same publication, the same writer says;—

" 'The attachment of the patient to the mesmeriser is one not of invariable but occasional occurrence, like every other phenomena which presents itself in the mesmeric condition. It has various degrees—from a mere satisfaction with the company and proximity of the mesmeriser, to such intensity of affection that he will not allow him to move an inch away, perhaps not to withdraw from actual contact, not to speak to others, perhaps not to speak of others; and at the same time the proximity of others may be distressing and the contact of others absolutely maddening.'—*Zoist*, No. IX., p. 52.

" 'I had one patient whose attachment in the mesmeric state was so violent and so exclusive, that she always insisted on holding my hand; was displeased, when even apparently in a very deep sleep, if I spoke to others; appeared to hear nothing said by others, though what was said might be calculated to render her unable to restrain herself from shewing that she heard it; appeared not to hear any noise, however loud, sudden, or disagreeable, made by others, unless she mistook it for a noise made by me; would allow nobody but

myself to be at a short distance from her, nor more than two, sometimes not more than one, besides myself, to be in the room; nor allow any other animal, even a bird, to be near her; nor allow me to *mention* any other person, nor even a living brute. She was angry if I mentioned her father or sister, both whom she dearly loved when awake; if I mentioned a dog, bird, fish, a fly, or even the mites of cheese, as alive: but if I spoke of birds or fish as dishes, and therefore no longer alive, she experienced no annoyance. Jealousy could not be carried to a higher pitch.’—*Ibid.*, p. 53.

“ ‘When this excitement of attachment is strong, it may remain till the patient is quite awake; and recur after waking, if he falls back into the sleep-waking. The young lady whose exclusiveness extended even to the brute creation was often awakened with great difficulty, and remained long lost between sleeping and waking. In this state she would run about the room after me, and if I left it force open the door. On one or two occasions I thought I had fully awakened her, but a degree of heaviness returned, and she felt drawn, and ran to the side of the house, a corner house, corresponding with the street in which she thought I was; and has gone to the window inclined to throw herself out after me; but the remains of sleep soon went off, and the feeling then completely subsided.’—*Ibid.*, p. 55.

“ Beside this, which may be properly called *attachment*, and perhaps in cases where no particular feeling of attachment is manifested, there is an *attraction* of the patient to the mesmeriser, which is excited by the will of the magnetizer, and induced by what are called ‘*traactive passes*.’ This attraction, indeed, resembles the cases of subdued will; and a strong and singular instance is given by Dr. Elliotson, who says as follows, with a reference to a

“ ‘Case of the cure of intense and hereditary fits, in which there was this attraction to the mesmeriser and disgust of others, but in which any other person could draw a part or the whole of the patient; even better than I could, if I tried to draw on the left side and the stranger to draw on the right, which was the more susceptible side. This patient was obliged to move in the direction of the *traactive passes*, yet frowned all the time with anger at the stranger’s doings. Like the attraction to me and the repulsion of strangers, the *traactive passes* never produced an immediate effect, perhaps none till I had ceased to make any, and their first effect was always a frown, in the subject of this narrative. The frown showed the motions from *traction* to be *volitions*, though compulsory. The result was probably through the necessity of obedience.’—*Zoist*, No. V., p. 58.

“ In pursuing the subject, he adds on the next page:—

“ ‘Another patient, of equal truth and of high rank, when asked in her sleep-waking state, with her eyes closed, why she moves this way or that, replies that she must, because I am drawing her. Ano-

ther, in the same state, but who invariably mistakes the person and time, always denies while being drawn that she is moving at all. I suspect that the effect results from an impulse to obey what is conceived an order; though the patient may be little or not at all conscious of this. It is not an impulse to imitate, because a movement of a hand or finger, and the elevation or inclination of the body are not the same actions. It is not attraction, because you may draw the patient by the hand in a direction opposite to yourself, and the excitement of the organ of Attachment by the finger, while it promotes attraction, does not in the least increase the facility of traction. It all looks like a beckoning and following. Two patients, who rise and follow in this manner, declare they do so because I *call* them, though I have not spoken; and they insist that I did not beckon to them, and indeed their eyes are firmly closed and they stumble against everything. They feel ordered, though they mistake the mode; and they equally obey the septic who draws and does not will any effect.—*Ibid.*, p. 59.

“ But it seems as if in some cases there was an *attraction* wholly independent of the will, or even knowledge, of either party. This may be illustrated by a very curious case reported by Mr. Parsons, of Brighton, in *The Zoist*. He had been, ever since the 8th of May, 1848, attending a lad who had then been suffering for six weeks from cataleptic insanity. The condition of the patient had so greatly improved that,

“ ‘ July 21. He went into the country, and was left there with his aunt, very comfortable and happy and quite rational.

“ ‘ September 7th. I have received several letters from him to this date, and have had satisfactory accounts: but, being alarmed by the information that he had a very bad fit on Friday week, which lasted for several hours, I determined yesterday to go and see him myself.

“ ‘ I did not write to warn him of my coming; and, when I arrived at his aunt’s house in Bishopstown, she expressed great regret, as Frank had been sent off by her to Newhaven only half an hour before, and he was told by her to take his time, saunter about when there and amuse himself, and not be back before 12 o’clock, as she feared it would fatigue him to return too quickly. The distance from Bishopstown to Newhaven is two miles and a half by road, but one mile less by the hill-path. It was now half-past ten.

“ ‘ I was curious to know if the extreme attraction which he manifested was yet removed (he having been away from me six weeks), as, if not, I conjectured he would soon be drawn irresistibly back without being sent for. I therefore declined the offer of his aunt to send a boy for him, and walked over the hill myself.

“ ‘ When I had walked about half way to Newhaven, I saw, at a distance, Frank coming quickly back through the meadows, and, as I drew nearer to him, something mechanical in his manner of walking made me suspect he was still asleep. But, to give him a chance, I

swerved away some yards from his path as we drew near to each other, that I might observe him without embarrassing him, and whether he were awake. I wished also to see if he would betray any knowledge of me in any way, as he does not know me in his waking state. As we passed each other he staggered, but went on, and I saw that his eyes were nearly closed, as they always were in his somnambulism. His pace instantly diminished like that of a person who was before in a great hurry to go somewhere and had suddenly remembered something left behind. I turned back and followed him; and, when I had nearly overtaken him, he staggered and edged away backwards towards me, till he touched me with his shoulder, and stood still as fast asleep as ever. He could not answer any question till I had removed the rigidity of the organs of speech: and, as I took his arm and led him home over the hill, he told me all about himself that I wished to know.

“‘Q. Well, Frank, how are you?

“‘A. Very much better, Sir, thank you. (Indeed he has grown so fat he can scarcely button his coat, and he is quite brown with health and exercise out of doors.)

“‘Q. What made you in such a hurry to come back? Your aunt told you not to return till twelve o’clock.

“‘A. I could not help it, Sir: I felt drawn home as fast as I could come.

“‘He then detailed as follows,—When his aunt told him to stay at Newhaven so long, he felt that there was an *inconsistency* in this request that he could not reasonably account for and had never before felt (I then was very near to Bishopstown): and as he was walking over the hill (I went round by the road) at one point he must have lost his senses, and he was nearly drawn off the road into a ditch (this was probably when the interval between us was shortest,—the time of his *perihelion* as it may be called:) he recovered himself, however, and went on to Newhaven. When there, he thinks his manner was odd: he could scarcely do what he went to do, a strong anxiety to return overpowering every other thought,—a vague influence urging him back to Bishopstown without any delay. He was nearly asleep (mesmeric) when he left Newhaven, and was quite so when he met me in the meadow’—*Zoist*, No. XXIV., p. 364.

“In this case it seems to be quite clear, that when the patient ‘was nearly drawn off the road into a ditch,’ neither party had any idea of proximity to the other. The lad seems to have been attracted simply (to borrow Miss Aglionby’s words) ‘as the needle by the magnet.’ The attraction was not caused, and could be controlled, by the will of the mesmeriser. ‘When I left him,’ says Mr. Parsons, ‘I feared that he would follow me, and I mentioned my fears. ‘Will me to sit still,’ was the reply. I did so, and he remained in his chair while I left the cottage, fast asleep.’*

* “I must explain, by the fact that I had not at hand No. XXIV. of *The*

"A second point to be observed is, that the influence which the mesmeriser is said to exert over his patients is in some cases, if I may so speak, *prospective*—that is, not (as in the cases cited) influencing the will or the actions of the patient for the time present, but only exacting from the sleep-waker a promise to do, or to think, something specific after he shall have been awaked and restored to his natural state, and to a perfect unconsciousness of having been asleep at all, or made any promise whatever. We are told that such promises are given; and that the patient, though during intervening days or weeks wholly unconscious of having made any promise, is at the time which had been arbitrarily fixed on, *irresistibly* impelled to do that which fulfils it. One of the simplest instances is furnished by Mr. Brindley, and relates to Serena Price, one of his clairvoyant patients already mentioned. On the 1st of October, 1843, she had been mesmerised 'in the presence of forty or fifty ladies and gentlemen,' and had shewn several curious phenomena belonging to the sleep-waking state. Mr. Brindley tells us,—

" 'Before demesmerising her, I requested her in five minutes time to get up off her chair, and blow all the candles out in the room. After restoring her, at the time specified she rose from her chair, and blew out all the candles. When asked why she did that, she said she could not tell, but that she felt unhappy till she had done it, and that the impulse was *irresistible*. When asked if she recollected my telling her to blow out the candles, she said, 'No; and thought I should not tell her anything of that sort, it made her look so foolish.' Of everything else that had transpired during her sleep-waking, she was equally oblivious.'—*Zoist*, No. VII., p. 366.

"The reader who wishes for more full information, I would refer to what Dr. Elliotson has written on this subject, particularly in *The Zoist*, No. XI. He there says,—

" 'It is well known that impressions may be made upon patients in their sleep-waking, which lead to acts in their ordinary state, though in acting they are perfectly ignorant of the reason.

Zoist (which was not indeed returned to me until the preceding page had been printed off) my failing to notice some remarks which Dr. Elliotson there made on this case, while I have given their substance and almost their words, as my own. I need not say that, writing with a view to illustrate the matter and, indeed, on every account, I should rather have stated what I did on Dr. Elliotson's authority than on my own. He says:—'Without the ordinary demonstration of the *sensitiment of friendship*, or plain attachment, there may be a manifestation of attraction to the mesmeriser from the strength of the mesmeric susceptibility of the patient. The influence of Mr. Parsons upon Frank, described at pp. 364-5, when between Bishopstow and Newhaven the boy was nearly drawn off the road, is parallel with the drawing which was felt by Miss Aglionby from even the unknown proximity of her medical attendant and mesmeriser, Mr. Nixon.'—p. 378."

“ ‘My first experiments of this kind were upon a lady of rank, July 25, 1842. In her sleep-waking, she foretold all the course of her complaints without ever being wrong, and prescribed with invariable success for herself. She once prescribed two grains and a half of extract of Belladonna at bed-time; and promised me she would take it. After waking her I did not inform her of what had passed; but she took the quantity of Belladonna, and with benefit. On sending her to sleep the next night, she informed me *she could not help* taking it; and that whatever promise she made in her sleep, she should keep it when awake. I then begged her on waking the third time,—for she always awoke spontaneously in about ten minutes, and I therefore was in the habit of sending her off three times,—to lift the candlestick and put it down again. On awaking the third time she extended her hand to the heavy silver candlestick which was at some distance from her, as she lay on the sofa, and drew it towards her—her weakness was such that lifting it was impossible, and what she did was an effort and for no apparent purpose.’—*Zoist*, No. XI., p. 362.

“The following extracts are made from accounts of other patients, given by Dr. Elliotson in the same paper, and contain a very small part of the illustration that might be drawn from it:—

“ ‘In her sleep-waking I begged her to take up two books from the table when she awoke. She thought it impossible, as in her ordinary state she had never remembered anything of her mesmeric. However, as I told her it would be a kindness to me and her mesmeric attachment to me was strong, she promised, on the proviso however that she remembered her promise. After I had awakened her, and she had involuntarily followed me about the room some time, as was habitual with her, for the intense attraction to me in the mesmeric state always continued for many minutes after the sleep-waking was over, she went to the table, and, laughing and looking vexed, took up a book, and after a little while, with vexation strongly depicted in her countenance, she took up the other. I made no remark and bid her good bye.’—*Ibid.*, p. 364.

“ ‘I requested a young lady whom I long mesmerised with the never-tiring devotion of a parent, and in whom I produced a variety of phenomena to promise to be unable on waking to see her maid, who always sat in the room at work during my visits, till I left the room, and then at once to discern her. On waking she did not see the maid, but said she saw the chair in which the maid sat; presently, however, she saw the maid—was agitated, had an hysterical fit, and passed into the sleep-waking state. I now enquired how she came to see her maid, as I had not left the room, and told her she must not when I woke her again. I then awoke her again; she could not see the maid, was astonished at the maid’s absence, and at first supposed she was in an adjoining room; but presently rang the bell twice, though the woman was standing before her. I moved

just out of the room, leaving the door open, and she saw the maid instantly, and was astonished and laughed.'—*Ibid.*, p. 365.

The next instance, though not the most interesting in some other respects, is remarkable on account of the length of time during which the 'impression' was required to last—that is, the period during which the patient was required to remain under the obligation, though unconscious of it, before the promise was fulfilled. Of a young lady, who had been his patient, Dr. Elliotson says ;—

“ ‘The day before she left London, she promised Dr. Engledue in her sleep to write to him on the day four weeks after her return home, and her father made a note of her promise at the time. She arrived at home June 26th, she wrote July 24th, and Dr. Engledue received the letter July 25th. Mr. Baldoek had given her some stock seed, and Dr. Engledue prevailed on her in her sleep to promise him to sow it and place a stick at each end of the row, with the words Mesmero-Baldoekian Stocks. In her letter to Dr. Engledue she says, ‘the morning after my arrival I safely deposited my Mesmero-Baldoekian stock seed in the ground, not neglecting to put their name largely written on stieks, at each end in the row.’ Hearing of all this from Dr. Engledue, I wrote and asked her why she did so. Her reply was,—‘September 7 : The day I received the seeds from Mr. Baldoek, I took them with me to your house enclosed in his letter, which I had not had time to read. I remember that when you awoke me, I told my aunt I thought of giving the seeds the before-mentioned name, which on my return to my lodgings I found written on the envelope of Mr. B.’s letter by Dr. Engledue. I was much amused by the circumstance altogether, and when I sowed the seed I thought I would write their name largely at each end of the row, that I might not forget it ; and as it was written by Dr. Engledue, I thought I should like him to know that I did not intend their appellation to be lost.

“ ‘I felt as though I should be neglecting a great duty were I to lose another post, though I had had plenty of time before, even more than on that day ; and was surprised and ashamed to think I should have so long delayed writing to thank him for his kindness to me while under your care.’

“ ‘It was long before the reason of her writing was communicated to her in the waking state by her aunt.

“ ‘She promised Mr. Thompson also in her sleep to write to him, and she did ; but not having seen him often in her waking state, it was with many apologies, clearly not well knowing, Mr. T. tells me, why she wrote, and he had given her his address in her sleep only. The reason she gives me in a letter is, that ‘he appeared to take great interest in her case, and as she was not *quite* better when he left town, she thought she would write and tell him that she was perfectly restored, and by mesmerism alone.’—*Ibid.*, p. 367.

"Many experiments are recorded which were tried with another patient. In some of which "the delusion to occur on waking" was "to taste raspberries"—"to hear an organ playing 'God save the Queen'"—"to feel a strong heat on the back of her left hand"—"not to see M. A. till I coughed, and then to see her but with my hat on, and me with M. A.'s bonnet on. She awoke spontaneously, and it succeeded perfectly," &c. But there is one instance which I would not give otherwise than in Dr. Elliotson's own words;—

" 'To think she should go to the devil. 'I fear it will be difficult, because I do not believe there is such a being as the devil: every one's bad inclinations are his devil.' 'Never mind; nor more do I.' On waking she was silent, and remained in her chair. I smiled; and she very faintly returned it. 'What is the matter?' She faintly replied, 'Nothing,' and looked very sad. After a pause, 'I am miserable.' 'Why?—tell me.' 'No.' After much entreaty, she took me aside, for she had risen and Mary Ann was in the room, and whispered, 'I fear I shall go to the devil.' I laughed and said, 'Why you don't believe there is a devil.' 'I think I shall go to him.' I coughed, and instantly her face brightened up, and she smiled. 'What is it?' She laughed joyfully, and said, 'I am happy now, but have been unwell.' 'Indeed!' and wondered what could have come to her. She only laughed on, as did M. A.,' &c. —*Ibid*, p. 372.

"I have mentioned, and given a few extracts relative to, these different points, because they are very important for the illustration of that one to which I particularly wish to direct the reader's attention. I mean the power which the mesmeriser is said to have of *influencing*, or acting on his patient, by his own *will*; that *will* not being expressed to the patient, or to any one else, in any way whatever. On this subject Dr. Elliotson has spoken with the straightforward clearness and honesty which eminently characterize his statements of facts, and give even to strangers like myself, a strong confidence that he knows what he means to say, and believes it to be true. At the same time, I cannot quote what is said in the extracts which follow, without expressing the suspicion which I feel, that he may not be altogether correct in his conception of the philosophy of the will. But this is not the place for an enquiry which would lead us into very subtle and irreverent discussion. For my present object is not to investigate the nature of the human will, or the modes of its exercise, and manifestation; but merely (in the first instance at least) to lead the reader to understand and consider the power which mesmerisers profess to have, as a matter of fact. We will, therefore allow Dr. Elliotson to say what he pleases of his

own will, and only remark, that it adds value to his avowal of belief respecting that of others. He says ;—

“ ‘ My *will* has hitherto been powerless in all mesmeric experiments. I have never yet accomplished *anything* in mesmerism by it alone . . . nay, I have never satisfied myself that I have increased the power of other proceedings by the most intense will, or impaired the result from not willing at all. A daily proof that the *will* is not the great cause of mesmeric effects is, that their varieties come out in different subjects quite unexpectedly ; and when persons manipulate who know so little of the matter as not to comprehend what they find themselves produce.’—*Zoist*, No. III. p. 242. .

“ ‘ I have repeatedly said that *will* as I would, I have never been able to produce any effect by mere *will* : and could never see any reason to think that when I used manipulations or other visible means, their efficiency was at all different whether I at the same time excited my *will* to the utmost or thought of other matters so as not to be aware that I *willed* at all. . . . But I never thought of denying the influence of the *will* because I had not witnessed its power. In July, 1843, (*Zoist*, No. III. p. 240,) at a meeting of the Phrenological Association, I said, ‘ I myself have never produced any mesmeric effect by the *will*. But so many persons have related experiments to me which appear satisfactory that I must admit its influence.’—*Ibid.* No. XI. p. 319.

“ ‘ I have never doubted the power of the *will* over persons in the mesmeric state or susceptible of it. The testimony of others has always been too powerful for me to entertain a doubt, though I have never obtained any evidence of the power of my own *will*. During the process of mesmerising I have repeatedly *willed* with all my might till I was fatigued, and never once found the period usually required for the production of sleep-waking in the individual patient shortened in the least.’—*Ibid.* No. XIX. p. 253.

“ ‘ The mere *will* of another person very often is able to produce them, though I have never been able to make it even probable in any trials I have made that my *will* has had any share in producing the phenomena which I have effected by mesmeric means. A very remarkable example of the true mesmeric influence was that of Mr. Henry S. Thompson and a lady, who, being then both determined sceptics, resolved to play a trick upon a party. It was arranged that he should make passes and she go to sleep and exhibit phenomena ; when to his utter astonishment his passes proved effective, and the lady fell into a true mesmeric coma.’ ”—*Ibid.* No. XVIII. p. 118.

Extract from The Zoist, No. XXVIII., January, 1850.

“Review of ‘*Illustrations and Enquiries relating to Mesmerism*, Part I., by the Rev. S. R. MAITLAND, D.D., F.R.S., F.S.A., some time Librarian to the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and Keeper of the MSS. at Lambeth. London: William Stephenson.’—pp. 82.

“DR. MAITLAND, a gentleman already known in the literary world, has published a pamphlet on the subject of Mesmerism, some notice of which may perhaps be acceptable to our readers.

“The author is a person of undoubted learning and ingenuity; and he is also, in his notions on this subject especially, what some would call original, and others perhaps odd; delighting to take a different view from what has occurred or was likely to occur to any other mortal.

“He is not one of those who deride all the accounts of mesmeric phenomena as impostures or idle fancies: nor, again, is he one of the *Diabolists*;—viz., those who coolly refer to the agency of foul fiends whatever they dislike and cannot explain: and yet he condemns all employment of mesmerism on the ground of a prohibition in Scripture; *i.e.*, in the MOSAIC LAW, which he seems to regard as binding on all the Christian World!

“The pamphlet begins with the descriptions of several remarkable cases which have from time to time been brought before the public, of the curative and other effects of mesmeric influence. The author, though not pledging himself for the correctness of the accounts given, yet seems far from regarding them with incredulity.

“Among the cases to which public attention has been called, though a considerable number relate to somnambulism and clairvoyance, these, as is well known, are but a small proportion compared with those in which no such phenomena have occurred, and in which the mesmeric agency has operated only in the removal or mitigation of pain or disease. Mesmerism however, cannot, according to Dr. Maitland, be *divided*. It must be either wholly allowable or wholly unlawful. On this principle, if there be *any* mode of employing Gunpowder, or Alcohol, Opium, Lytta, and other such drugs, that is permitted or is reprobated, the permission, or the condemnation, must extend to *every* mode of employing those agents. This, we apprehend, is one of Dr. Maitland’s points of originality, or at least of singularity.* For most persons

* “Among other Singularities, Dr. M. declares that he never could meet

consider that it makes all the difference whether gunpowder be used for blasting rocks or for murdering men; and whether opium or other powerful drugs be employed to cure disease, or to destroy life, or produce stupefaction, or other still worse effects.

“He next proceeds to prove (?), by an examination of certain Hebrew roots, that the ‘witchcraft’ (so called in our translation of the Old Testament)* and the employment of what are called ‘familiar Spirits,’ which was forbidden to the Israelites, were neither more nor less than mesmeric clairvoyance.

“He denies the comparatively modern notions of witches making compact with evil spirits, and employing their services: though these notions (whenever they arose) certainly prevailed in those Ages to which Dr. M. is supposed to look back with regretful veneration. The charges of witchcraft brought against Eleanor, Duchess of Gloucester, and others long before her time, are among the instances.

“However, for the ‘wisdom of our ancestors’ in these matters Dr. M. has no respect. And he does not seem to have much more for the belief of those whom Christians usually regard as Inspired Writers. On this last point, indeed, he is, whether designedly or accidentally, not very clear in his language. But the impression likely to be left on the minds of most of his readers, is, that he regards all that is said in Scripture of Demoniacal Agency, of whatsoever kind, as either a mistake with the Writers, or else a condescension to popular prejudice;—a practice of that kind of ‘pious fraud’ which the modern Tractite-School call *Phenakism*. The damsel at Philippi, for instance, possessed by ‘a spirit of divination,’ he plainly seems to consider as nothing more than a Clairvoyant Somnambulist. And all the arts of Magie, Witchcraft, &c.—so called—which we find mentioned or alluded to in ancient writers, sacred or profane, he considers as no other than mesmeric phenomena.

“This conclusion rests on the supposed etymology of the Hebrew word אוב, (rendered, in our version a ‘familiar

with persons who had dreamed (except in the mesmeric sleep) that they were eating or drinking! If he has really any curiosity on the subject, he has only to read some of the many published narratives of shipwrecked mariners and others, who have been exposed to famine. It is generally mentioned that they were perpetually haunted by such dreams. But even with those not so circumstanced, these dreams are very common, and he may ascertain if he will make *bona fide* inquiries among his neighbours.

* “The word which in the New Testament (Epistle to the Galatians) is rendered ‘witchcraft,’ is *Pharmakeia*, evidently, ‘poisoning:’ *Pharmaka* being the common word to denote noxious drugs.

spirit,') which he conjectures, from similarity of sound, to be derived from a root signifying to 'will.' This he confirms from the procedure of the Septuagint-Translators, (who were influenced, very likely, by the same supposed etymology,) in their rendering of the word which is, in our version, 'dealers with familiar spirits,' by a word derived from a corresponding Root in Greek.

"The Septuagint-Translators have also, Dr. Maitland remarks, applied to those pretending to, or influenced by, magical arts, the title of 'engastrimuthoi,' literally 'Ventriloquists:' and this, in his opinion, identifies these with magnetized patients, because some of these latter are reported to have appeared to speak from their stomachs. Hence it is inferred (though without directly claiming infallibility for the Septuagint translators) that the 'witchcraft'—so called—or 'dealing with familiar spirits,' which was forbidden to the Israelites, was the mesmeric process by which the WILL of the Mesmeriser gains a control over that of his patient.

"The influencing of the 'will' by *the arts of persuasion*, which has, in all ages, been the aim of the *Orator*, Dr. M. does not advert to at all: so that whether *this* was prohibited, or not, in the Mosaic Law, he leaves undecided. But that the influence exercised by a *Mesmeriser's* 'will' was the 'Witchcraft,' or 'Magic,' or 'dealing with familiar spirits,' which was forbidden in that Law, is evidently his decision: and moreover (2) that the prohibition is binding on Christians; and (3) that it must be understood as extending to *all* employment of mesmerism, even in cases where the 'will' is not at all concerned.

"The whole process of reasoning, therefore, which in this pamphlet is diffused through several chapters, may be compressed and summed up in a kind of sorites; which would make Archbishop Whately's or Mr. Mill's hair stand on end. Let us suppose a person disposed to try the effect of mesmeric treatment on a patient,—perhaps some dear relative or friend—labouring under blindness, or some other disease, which has baffled medical skill: he is to reason thus;—

"*'One* use of mesmerism is likely to benefit the case: *'but another* kind of application of it *may possibly* be the *AUB* which was forbidden in the Mosaic Law: and *some* of the precepts of that law are binding on all men: therefore it is probable that any use of mesmerism is forbidden to Christians. Q.E.D.

"*'Therefore* my parent or my child shall be left in blindness, or die in lingering pain, rather than be *so* relieved, for fear of displeasing Him who said, "I was sick and ye minis-

‘tered unto me : . . . forasmuch as ye did it unto one of these
‘my brethren ye did it unto me.’

“Now is all this meant seriously, or merely as a *jeu d’esprit*, designed to shew how ingeniously a paradox may be maintained? And is it worthy of a serious examination?

“This latter question has caused us some perplexity, on remembering the ridicule to which Seneca was exposed for undertaking a serious refutation of the paradox put forth by some of his Stoical predecessors, that ‘the Cardinal Virtues were Animals.’

“But we have come to the conclusion that though Dr. Maitland probably *began* with no other thought than of making a trial of his skill, and a display of his learning, it is not unlikely that he *ended* by being himself entangled in the meshes of his own ingenuity; and that it is probable some of his readers may be entangled along with himself. If any of them were to cast his eye over a publication which has been pretty generally known for the last 30 years, the *Historic Doubts relative to Napoleon Buonaparte*, he would perceive that a far stronger case is there made out against the existence of that illustrious personage, than by Dr. M. against the lawfulness of the employment of Mesmerism. But in the one case there is, and in the other there is not, a strong prejudice on the side of the paradox. We will therefore offer a few remarks on Dr. Maitland’s theory.

“It rests on the interpretation (an interpretation which has escaped all the learned for twenty or thirty centuries) of a Hebrew word; which again rests on the etymology of this word; and that again, on a similarity of sound.

“Now of the mistakes in etymology which have been made, even by persons not destitute of intelligence, and of the erroneous notions based on such mistakes, numerous examples might be given. Josephus notices one; that of an ancient writer who says that Jerusalem (‘Hierosolyma’) derived its name from its being decorated with the spoils of heathen temples, and was originally called *Hierosyla*, ‘temple-plunder.’

“Again, the English word ‘Canseway’—more properly ‘Causey,’ as being manifestly the French *Chausée*, a bank,—I have known pronounced, and even spelt, by educated persons ‘crossway,’ from their mistake as to the origin of the word.

“Gilly-flower, again, some persons consider as so called, *quasi* *July-flower*; though certainly its blooming in the most flowery month of the year is no such *distinction* as to be likely to give rise to its name; since the same would suit most of

the flowers of our gardens. In reality it is named from its odour, from the French '*Gilofre*,' (often so written by old writers for '*girofle*,') a 'clove,' apparently a derivative of '*Caryophyllus*.'

"Again, a well-known tenant of our poultry-yards is supposed by some to have been originally brought from the country called Turkey; though in reality it is indigenous in America alone, and derives its name, doubtless, from its own call of 'turk, turk.'

"In old English again,—for instance, in the prayer-book version of the Psalms—'runnagate' is written for 'renegade,' (which is the Spanish '*Renegado*,'—one who has renounced his faith,) on the supposition, apparently, that it meant '*run-away*,'—'fugitive.'

"And many other instances might be given.

"How unsafe must it be therefore to build important practical conclusions on etymologies of a language like the Hebrew, of which we have such scanty remains; while of the contemporary languages and dialects of the neighbouring nations, (from which several of their terms may have been derived) we know absolutely nothing!

"However, let us for argument's sake suppose Dr. Maitland's hypothesis to be demonstrably established: let it be supposed that this puzzling word *AUB* was understood by the ancient Hebrews as applicable to persons who were in reality (though not then known to be) mesmeric clairvoyants, or their mesmerizers: what is the inference? That the *Mosaic Law* forbade application to be made to them. The next enquiry evidently is, whether this law is binding on *us*.

"In this enquiry Dr. Maitland affords us no help whatever. But we presume that he, in common with nearly all other Christians for the last seventeen centuries, does *not* consider the *Mosaic Law* as of universal and perpetual obligation. He cannot maintain at least that the Christian church requires abstinence from swine's-flesh and other meats, forbidden to the Jews; or prohibits the sowing of a field with divers kinds of seeds; or requires a childless widow to marry her deceased husband's brother; or forbids a man to sell his land in perpetuity, &c. Yet on all these points the *Mosaic Law* contains precepts not resting on any newly discovered interpretation of some doubtful word, but perfectly plain to all, and about whose signification there never has been any question. But it is generally agreed among Christians, that, though 'no man is exempt from obedience to those commands which are called "*moral*," the obligation extends no further.' And if it be inquired *what* are 'moral precepts,' the obvious answer must

be, that we are to judge by the light of Reason what things are right or wrong in themselves, independently of any special injunction. Murder for instance, and Theft, and False Witness, we are bound to abstain from because morally wrong, even though it had not been noticed in the Mosaic Law. Anything again, which is *not* morally wrong, (such as wearing garments of mixed stuff, or eating Swine's flesh,) is allowable, even though forbidden to the Jews.

"If therefore Dr. Maitland can prove mesmerism to be an evil in itself, he will have proved that it ought not to be practised, even supposing that the *Aub* had nothing to do with it. If he can *not* prove this, then, even supposing the Mosaic Law does forbid it to the Jews, this does not concern us Gentiles. So that on either supposition, the whole of his ingenious theory,—even if based not on doubtful interpretations but on demonstrable truths,—would *go for nothing*. In the one case it would be *superfluous*; in the other, *foreign* to the real question.

"As for the particular reasons for forbidding to the Israelites several things which are, to all appearance, in themselves indifferent, most men who possess a fair share of good sense and of modesty acknowledge that in many instances they can give no explanation. And it would be absurd to suppose that each Mosaic ordinance is binding on us *till* we can shew both what were the reasons for the enactment, and that those reasons no longer exist. But in the present instance there seems no reason to doubt that the persons (whether Jews or Heathen) who practised and who resorted to 'Witchcraft,'—'Magic,'—'Aub,' or by whatever other name we may denote forbidden arts, did consider themselves as employing the agency of Demons;—of Beings called Gods, and worshipped by the heathen, quite distinct from Jehovah the God of the Jews. Now supposing that no such beings ever did really afford any aid to these Aubite-magicians, their idolatry,—since all sin consists in the *intention*—was precisely the same. When a king of Israel was rebuked for 'sending to consult the oracle of Baalzebub, the God of Ekron,' every child can understand that the sin consisted not in his *obtaining* a response from a real god at Ekron, but in his *seeking* it.

"So also, in the case of the Soothsaying damsel at Philippi already referred to; the people manifestly *believed* her possessed with a demon, to whose aid they *intended* to resort. Dr. Maitland seems to think that they were mistaken; and that Paul and Luke either partook of the delusion, or connived at it. But this makes no difference as to the reality of the popular belief and intention.

"And the church again, which, in the times referred to by Dr. M. denounced witchcraft, did so, evidently, under the conviction that it *was* a resort to the agency of evil spirits.

"Even supposing, therefore, that it were proved that all the cases of Magic, Witchcraft, &c., on record were in reality mesmeric, we can perfectly understand the reason of the prohibitions given to the Jews. It was designed to put down all attempts to resort to the aid of demons. Whether the attempt were successful or not,—whether the demons were real or imaginary—makes no difference as to the moral character of what was forbidden. And the reason of the prohibition no longer exists, when men have ceased to believe in or to attempt anything of the kind. No one would now scruple to ornament his furniture with a brazen figure of a serpent; because there is no danger now of its being an object of idolatrous worship, like the brazen serpent which king Hezekiah (very wisely and rightly) 'broke in pieces.'

"The only suggestion thrown out by Dr. Maitland that at all affects the real question—that as to the allowableness at the present day of employing the powers of mesmerism—is, that it is a very powerful agent, which *may* be abused to bad purposes. He remarks on the observation of Dr. Elliotson, as to the harmlessness of mesmerism 'unless' practised improperly; and exclaims, 'What an *unless*!' He might equally exclaim respecting an 'unless' in many other matters also. A Lunatic Asylum is a good thing, *unless* the patients are treated cruelly, or sane persons confined there. Opium is a valuable medicine, *unless* taken imprudently, or administered for the purpose of stupifying the victims of robbers. Steam-carriages are good, *unless* through negligence, they are driven off the rails, or the boilers burst. Government is a good thing, *unless* the governors oppress and rob their subjects. And Printing is a useful art, *unless* authors of more cleverness than discretion publish pamphlets calculated to mislead or perplex their readers. In short, there is no power, instrument, or institution possessed by man to which the same objection would not apply.

"What then is the practical inference Dr. M. would draw? Is it, that our rulers should pass a law to prohibit Mesmerism, Lunatic Asylums, the use of potent Drugs, Railroads, &c.; and lastly, (by a suicidal ordinance,) Government itself? For all these things are manifestly liable to very great and mischievous abuse. Or is it this; that, since bad men may make a hurtful use of mesmerism, therefore it should be left *entirely in the hands of bad men*, by an agreement and combination among all the best men to have nothing to do with it? One can

hardly suppose him to have deliberately adopted either of these conclusions; and yet there appears no other practical conclusion to which his observations can tend.

"The truth is, probably, that, as we formerly observed, he set out without *any* definite design at all, except to exercise his ingenuity and display his erudition; and that he ended in being himself bewildered.

"But be this as it may,—whether he has been throughout in earnest or in jest,—it is much to be wished that he would hereafter confine the sports of his genius to subjects in which no practical evil is likely to result.

"That will not have been the case in the present instance, if he shall have succeeded in influencing any one by what he has said. He will have done harm if he shall have succeeded in deterring some well-meaning but weak brethren from seeking relief from distressing maladies by means which the bounty of Providence has placed within their reach. He will have done harm if he shall have diminished the proportion of good men to bad among those who inquire into and endeavour to control an agent powerful for good or for evil. And he will have done harm in representing the Most High as requiring us to be guided in our daily duty by a precept so expressed that only *one man* in all Christendom could guess at its meaning—even that one being able *only* to *guess*—this precept, moreover, occurring in a code of Laws generally understood to be not binding on Christians: and yet to be obeyed even in opposition both to the express injunctions of Christianity, and to the dictates of natural morality, which alike direct us to administer relief to the afflicted.

"No more effectual way could he have taken to expose the religion he professes to odium and to scorn.

"A. B."

Extract from The Zoist, No. XXIX., July, 1850.

"*Observations on Dr. Maitland's Opinion that Clairvoyance is forbidden in the Old Testament.* By the Rev. GEORGE SANDBY, Vicar of Flixton, Suffolk.

"Flixton, February, 1850.

"SIR,—In the masterly refutation of Dr. Maitland's book, which appeared in your last number, the distinguished writer introduced an important argument, upon which, from the

evident purpose of brevity, he dwelt far less than all his readers could desire. It is almost presumptuous on my part to attempt to follow so powerful a pen: still it appears desirable to pursue the subject a little further, and fill the outline which he furnished more fully and more in detail. Many persons, who are not competent to enter into the learning and reasonings of the question, still cry out with Dr. Maitland, that 'clairvoyance is forbidden in the Old Testament,' on whom, perhaps, the following plain observations may not be without their weight.

"After a thorough sifting of Dr. Maitland's etymological theory, the reviewer concludes, at p. 399, with saying,—

" 'However, let us, for argument's sake, suppose this hypothesis to be established; let it be supposed that this puzzling word *AUB* was understood by the ancient Hebrews as applicable to persons who were in reality mesmeric clairvoyantes or their mesmerizers: what is the inference? Is this law binding on *us*? . . . It would be absurd to suppose that each Mosaic ordinance is binding on us, till we can shew both what were the reasons for the enactment, and that those reasons no longer exist. But in the present instance there seems no reason to doubt that the persons who practised 'witchcraft,' 'magic,' or 'aub,' did consider themselves as employing the agency of demons—of being called gods—and *worshipped by the heathen*,' &c., &c.

"A conclusive answer to Dr. Maitland's elaborate reasonings is at once found in the above extract. In fact, our learned opponent stopped short in the middle of his demonstration, forgetting that a *malum prohibitum* may not be a *malum in se*, and that a prohibition may only extend to a particular purpose; or, in other words, that even if modern clairvoyance be identical with the ancient *aub*, still that the relative circumstances may be different; and that the question yet remains, whether it were not the *circumstances*, and not the *quality of the action*, that rendered the practice criminal? 'Is it the whole truth?' asks Dr. Maitland, somewhat in a tone of condemnation and suspicion, when speaking of certain writers on mesmerism; and the very same question may fairly be retorted on the excellent doctor himself. Has he, in fact, given the whole statement of the case, context and all? Is there no 'reserve,' to quote his own quotation? or rather, no forgetfulness of an essential point? Granted, as the reviewer says, that the use of 'familiar spirits' was forbidden to the Israelites, and that 'familiar spirits' are now proved to be extatic clairvoyants, still what was the object of the prohibition? Simply because the practice was connected with the usages of idolatry. Idolatry, we know, was the besetting sin of the Israelites. Idolatry was the temptation under which

they most readily fell. Against the fascinations of idolatry the peculiarities of the Mosaic ordinances were especially directed. The principal aim of each established law, and of each threatening and judgment, was to mark to his people Jehovah's hatred of idolatry. And if we consult the *context* of those chapters in which this prohibition of 'familiar spirits' is expressly introduced, we shall find that the whole bearing of the injunction had reference to a connection with idolatry. *This point Dr. M. altogether ignores.* I can scarcely find any allusion to it; and yet it is the essential point,—the point which gives a clue to a right understanding of the interdict. And as every Christian reader, whose sympathies are with mesmerism, has an interest in the explanation, I will proceed to prove in detail the correctness of the assertion.

"If we turn, then, to the 19th and 20th chapters of Leviticus, where the first prohibition of 'familiar spirits' is recorded, it is clear from the whole context that the interdict had reference to the absurd and idolatrous customs of the people around. Many of the things forbidden in those chapters had confessedly nothing in them intrinsically wrong; they might be very silly, but they were not *per se* sinful; the evil consisted in the interpretation attached to them. The difference to be observed between clean and unclean beasts, a difference which, as we are now taught, is of no value, is introduced only a verse or two before that very passage which Dr. M. expressly quotes with some alarm, about a 'man or woman having a familiar spirit,' and being put to death. Again, though men were not to use 'enchantments,' they were also not to 'round the corners of their heads, nor to mar or shave the corners of their beards, nor to make themselves bald, nor to cut their flesh,' &c. It is impossible to disunite these trifling ordinances from commandments that appear to partake of a more serious character. They run into each other, as it were, and all refer to the same principle; and it is marvellous that a candid writer like Dr. Maitland should overlook their connection. True it is, that along with these trivial prohibitions are intermingled various injunctions of a strictly moral and permanent tendency; and the reason is obvious. The Canaanitish people, amongst whom the Israelites had arrived, were as eminently immoral as they were idolatrous; and the two offences were often so mixed up together, that the one class of sins was supposed to lead on to the other, and to create an assimilation between them. Consequently, to read these prohibitions aright, we must regard the object which was in view, and that was the avoidance of idolatry. And '*therefore*' it was, as Moses himself says

(chap. xx. 25), that the '*difference*' was enforced, and that the Israelites were not to 'walk in the *manners* of these people,' (ver. 23), and that they were 'separated from them.' And thus it is, that in the very verse antecedent to the one in which a 'familiar or clairvoyant spirit is ordered to be stoned,' it is strongly stated that the Israelites 'were to be *severed* from other people,' as clearly indicating thereby, as words can express it, that the condemnation of this particular practice, whatever it was, was with the purpose of rendering the Jewish people as unlike as possible to their neighbours. And yet of all these tendencies to idolatry, Dr. M. observes nothing: it seems a strange omission in his argument. But, to quote his own words, 'I mention the reserve, not to blame it, but simply as a matter of fact which ought to be known,' as throwing light upon those passages which *are* referred to.

"The next important passage, from which our author's scruples have arisen, is found in the eighteenth chapter of Deuteronomy, in which 'witches and necromancers and observers of times, and consulters of familiar spirits, &c.,' are forbidden; but here again, the purport of the prohibition has an undoubted reference to the connection of these usages with idolatry, but here also the Lambeth librarian is silent as before. It is true, that Dr. M. observes that the 'restriction related expressly to things which had been practised by those without the law, to the *abominations* of the nations, the sins of the heathens, for which they were to be destroyed,' implying by that, that they were abominations in themselves, (which is the very question at issue,) for he forgets to add, what the context clearly proves, that these particular abominations had become abominations from their being part and parcel of idolatrous superstitions. They were abominations relatively. Is the 'observance' of particular times or days an abomination in itself? Is a statue an abomination in itself? Is sculpture *unlawful* for a Christian? Is the planting a grove of any trees near unto the altar (or house) of the Lord, an abomination in itself? (chap. xvi. 21.) If the reader but turn to the 12th chapter, v. 30 and 31, and to the 20th chapter, v. 18, and to sundry other kindred passages, he cannot but see that all these 'abominations were done unto (or for) their gods;' that the nations provoked the Lord to anger with strange gods, and with their abominations, and sacrificed unto devils and not to God. This was the whole gist of the prohibition. The charge was anti-idolatrous. In all probability, the attendant circumstances of all these charms and divinations were as nonsensical and harmless in themselves as some of the fetish rites of the modern African, or the ceremo-

nial absurdities of the Polynesian priesthood. It was the intention that alone gave them importance or significance. Whether the things were in themselves real or false, or what is more probable, partly true, and partly wedded to imposture, matters not for the argument: the point that rendered them a sin and abomination was, that they were mixed up with the usages of heathenish worship. That this is the bearing of the whole passage must be clear to any one, who will carefully read through the three or four chapters preceeding the one in question; and yet I am almost certain, that the word 'idolatry' is not named, if it be even alluded to, in the course of our author's reasonings. The fact is, our commentator had so overlaid his mind with 'much learning' and with devotion to a theory, that the simplest point in the question slipped from his memory.

"And the more we pursue the inquiry, the more shall we be satisfied of the correctness of this explanation: for example, if we examine two instances which Dr. Maitland expressly brings forward 'as being peculiarly worthy of attention.'

"First he refers to the conduct of king Manasseh, who, amongst his other evil acts, 'dealt with familiar spirits.' Now whether these familiar spirits were 'willers' and clairvoyants, or, on the contrary, connected with practices utterly foreign to mesmerism, is unimportant. Manasseh is signalized for his wickedness; and his wickedness is pre-eminently characterized for its ultra-idolatry. The very little that is said of this king relates to that topic; and it is clear that he merely dealt with wizards and familiar spirits in subservience to his besetting propensity of idol-worship. Now there is no abstract harm in making a circle on the ground, and putting some herbs into a caldron, and burning some charecoal in the middle of a wood: but these acts become a sin, if they be done with a sinful purpose: and so with mesmerism and clairvoyance,—it is the *abuse* and not the *use* that condemns them.

"Secondly, Dr. M. refers to the good king Josiah, who, amongst his good actions, 'put away familiar spirits.' But why did he put them away? His history explains it; his whole reign was one uninterrupted protest against idolatry and idolatrous usages. He was a root and branch destroyer. Whatever had any connection with the abominations of heathenism found no mercy in his eyes: and he swept the whole tribe of its satellites out of the land of Judea; and amongst them, the unlucky clairvoyants, if such they were, suffered the same fate. But what argument is that? If men will pervert a good thing to bad purposes, they must take the

consequences: evil communications corrupt the purest and most lawful of usages, and clairvoyance is no exception. But verily, Dr. Maitland's two instances that are so 'peculiarly worthy of attention,' tell most provokingly against him.

"The only possible argument, as it appears to me, that Dr. Maitland can advance against this view of the subject, is this,—that the prohibition of all these usages is not stated *in direct terms* to be in consideration of their connection with idolatrous customs. No copulative conjunctions are introduced into the sentences, broadly affirming that 'on account of,' and 'in consequence of,' their idolatrous tendencies, these particular practices were interdicted. And this must be admitted. Our conclusion is derived from the context, and from its general harmony with other passages. But there is nothing unusual in this; it is rather in strictest keeping with the whole style of the Mosaic books. No one knows better than the learned librarian of Lambeth, that an elliptical form of composition is one of the characteristics of these very ancient writings. Let us take as an example, what every school boy is familiar with, the language of the Second Commandment. It is a precise case in point; and by its grammatical and conventional interpretation the matter at issue can be decided. Take the first sentences, as Dr. Maitland takes his sentence, abstractedly and by itself. 'Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or *any likeness of any thing*, that is in heaven, &c.'" What can be, *primâ facie*, more peremptory than this ordinance? There can be no evasion from its most direct language. Nothing must be constructed by human fingers that has the slightest similitude to any object existing on our earth. The words are positive. Dr. M. must not say, that this restriction has reference to the worship of idol-images, and that a *literal obedience* to its injunctions is no longer a point of universal obligation. Instructed by his casuistry, we must proceed more scrupulously. If clairvoyance *be* really alluded to in Leviticus and Deuteronomy, and its practice forbidden, and if no respect is to be paid to the context and to the sense of the adjoining chapters,—then on the very same grammatical principles, every young lady, who now designs a spaniel on her worsted work, every astronomer with his orrery, every botanist with his painted 'flora,' are alike guilty of the sin of disobedience. The one act is as much interdicted as the other: 'Thou shalt not *make* to thyself the *likeness of any thing*.' Nor will the subsequent sentence remove the difficulty. Taken literally and by itself, and without the admission of an elliptical construction, it rather *adds a fresh*

injunetion, instead of explaining the former away. "Thou shalt not bow down, &c." That is, *first*, we are not to make the likeness of any thing, and then we are not to worship it; but if we stop short of the second offence, it by no means follows that we are at liberty to commit the first one. Now, does Dr. Maitland take this passage in this literal way? If, on the contrary, he claims the conventional interpretation of this commandment, as applied to a Christian people, on the ground that the genius of the Hebrew language dispenses with those conjunctive particles, which would convert the sense of the two sentences into one harmonious whole; then must the interpreter be consistent with his own interpretations, and all his anti-clairvoyant texts must be explained by the same rules of exposition, and his hypothesis and its consequences fall to the ground. In common honesty, there is no alternative: there must be no playing fast and loose in matters of this serious nature: a man must abide by his construction in one place, or not hold by it in the other. Dr. Maitland, it should be remembered, is starting unexpected scruples for tender consciences: he 'particularly addresses himself to his clerical brethren,' (p. 48,) not forgetting among them some 'most zealous mesmerists,' to whose humble pages he does not disdain to allude. For myself, I will simply observe, that I have no wish to meddle with a forbidden practice. Let the prohibition of clairvoyance be clearly established on principles which will apply to other passages of the Old Testament, and I am content to obey: but let us not be frightened from the study of nature by the conjurations of an illogical erudition: nor let great truths be held forth as a subject for suspicion and avoidance on evidence at the best of a merely conjectural interpretation, and on canons of criticism which are not equally adopted in homogeneous passages.

"The religious mesmeriser, in whose mind doubts have been raised by Dr. Maitland's enquiries, will understand my argument better by an illustration taken from modern history. When Columbus, in his fourth voyage, was stationed off Jamaica, he was fearfully distressed by a scarcity of provisions. From his knowledge of astronomy, he was aware that within three days there would be a total eclipse of the moon; and, to induce the Indians to bring food to his ships, he asserted that the Deity was angry with them, and would shew his anger by a complete obscuration of that luminary. The stratagem answered. When the darkness commenced, the ignorant natives hurried down to the shore with provisions; and Columbus, by the success of his prediction, obtained a permanent influence over their minds. Now let us

suppose that, on the arrival of the Israelites in Canaan, an acquaintance with astronomy was confined to the heathenish priesthood, and that they annually availed themselves of this study, for the purpose of swaying their superstitious followers. Should we not then have read in Moses, of the 'abominations of eclipse-prophets,' and of threatenings against those who imitated them? But would the prohibition be now in force, and the compilation of an almanack be a thing sinful in itself? And yet there is no difference. The study of eclipses and the study of clairvoyance are equally but the studies of nature—of nature in some dark phase; and they are both alike sinful or innocent, according to the spirit with which they are undertaken. One difference, indeed, there is: in our own days, clairvoyance is a novelty, while the announcement of an eclipse is a familiar sound. And in matters of science, let it ever be remembered, it is the novelty that favours the cry of 'irreligion.'

"The whole point, then, of our author's argument resolves itself into this, that clairvoyance has been abused, and is consequently unlawful. An awkward inference! for if Dr. Maitland will but apply it to his own actions, he will find himself marvellously circumscribed in his movements and will. In every twenty-four hours there is scarcely a single action upon which our scrupulous opponent enters, that may not be perverted from its rightful purposes into an offence. Nay, let us hear his own words:

" 'Nothing can be more innocent than dipping a pen in ink, and writing a few words, but this does not make it lawful for one man to sign another's name to a deed.'—p. 69.

"And so of clairvoyance. Nothing can be more innocent or useful than the practice of introvision, by which a somnambule might deserv the internal condition of a sick man, and thereby enable a fatal disease to be arrested; but it does not thereby follow that all we wicked writers in *The Zoist* deem ourselves privileged to use the faculty of our clairvoyants for the purpose of prying into matters that do not concern us, and that we shall peep 'into the banker's shop or pawnbroker's cellar' (p. 70), to see if our best friend has overdrawn his account, or deposited his wife's jewels for an accommodation.

"The strangest point, however (with all deference be it said), in Dr. Maitland's book, is his last question, viz., 'is mesmerism divisible?' In other words, our author, who is a man of humanity, is naturally well inclined towards the therapeutic departments of our science, and would be glad to 'see

a mesmeric hospital well supported and well filled; but he entertains objections against clairvoyance and the 'higher phenomena,' and is desirous of learning whether the mere mesmeric treatment can be obtained apart from and independent of the other? Of course we cannot but respect the scruples of a conscientious man; but surely, that any one, with the acquirements of Dr. Maitland, should gravely propose this last interrogatory, seems (I really mean nothing uncivil) almost an absurdity. 'Is mesmerism divisible?' In other words, is nature divisible? Is nature under our control? Can we stop, or propel, or guide or moderate the invisible workings of a sentient animal like man, whose composite constitution is an enigma, and of the immediate causes of whose vitality and action not the profoundest physiologists are yet agreed? All that we are taught is, that 'God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life,' and that 'man is a living soul,' 'fearfully and wonderfully made,' but beyond this we are in darkness. We can map out the brain, indeed, and we can classify the nerves; but to what extent the powers of the brain or of the nerves may yet reach, we know not. And to suppose that the movements of the brain or of the nerves when in an abnormal condition, can be regulated like those of a locomotive steam-engine, whose speed is arrested by the finger of a conductor, is to transform our mysterious being into a mere piece of human workmanship, and to regard man as more of a machine than the most ultra-materialist ever described him. Mesmerism must be accepted, as we accept all other gifts of God's providence, as a whole, and not in chosen and special parts; we must take nature as we find her; we cannot refuse what we do not chance to value; we must follow truth, where truth, perforce, may lead us. We cannot say to nature, in any one of her departments, 'Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther.' We cannot raise up some scientific Canute, who shall sit in his professional chair, and bid the waves of human knowledge roll backward and be still. Do we divide astronomy? Do we divide geology, chemistry, or optics? Do we bid Lord Rosse rest contented with the eyes that Providence has given him, and not pry into worlds that were never meant for man's inspection, by the aid of 'unlawful' and presumptuous telescopes. Do we warn the Dean of Westminster against pre-Adamite theories, and require a line of demarcation between a permissible or forbidden geology? Or do we tell the accomplished Professor Wheatstone that it was never intended for finite beings to imitate the lightning's velocity of action, by the uses of a too adventurous electricity? No: we do nothing of the

kind. And why, then, are we to employ this language in mesmerism, more than in any other study? I can only imagine, because that it is comparatively a *new* study, because we are not familiar with its results and its marvels. It is, indeed, surprising that Dr. Maitland, who has read so much on the subject, does not perceive that the various phenomena are often so mixed up together, that an interruption of their union would be impossible; that the therapeutic processes spontaneously develop the clairvoyant powers, and that the clairvoyant powers are actually ancillary to the therapeutic processes; and that while many mesmerists, during their whole practice, in spite of all their efforts and their 'willings,' can induce little beyond the cure or mitigation of disease (results, indeed, sufficiently valuable of themselves), other practitioners seem hardly able to enter upon a case without eliciting indications of the highest classes of magnetic phenomena. In fact, there is but one division to be dreamt of, the division between the *use* and *abuse* of the practice;—the division between the benevolent, the truth-loving practitioner, and the man who degrades the secrets of nature to his own selfish purposes, and to the charlatan tricks of simulation and fraud.

"One consideration raises a smile. Dr. Maitland's scruples, it is seen, have respect to clairvoyance; but mesmerism, in its ordinary application to surgery or sickness, he estimates as highly as any of us could wish. He has known mesmerism, he says, to be true 'for more than twenty years,' and he thinks that 'every person of common humanity must earnestly desire to promote, by all lawful means, a method which offers such benefits.' This is the language of a Christian and a philosopher; and I thank the excellent writer for his outspoken benevolence and honesty. But is he aware that for such language he will assuredly be denounced in certain quarters, as being 'little better than one of the wicked?' He takes, indeed, a high tone with us; but how will he stand with more precise and more timorous consciences? Nothing, let it be observed by the way, more evinces the improved position of mesmerism in this country, than the language and the scruples of Dr. Maitland. When, in April, 1842, not quite eight years back, Dr. McNeile preached at Liverpool that unlucky sermon of his on 'satanic agency,' not a syllable fell from his lips respecting clairvoyance. Clairvoyance was not even alluded to. Clairvoyance was in that day too preposterous a question to be even mooted for a moment. The whole drift of the Liverpool argument was upon—what?—aye, what?

Insensibility to pain! Mark this, Dr. Maitland! The extreme sinfulness of a condition in which a painless and formidable operation could be performed, and in which a wound could be dressed, and cleaned, and dressed again, without the patient knowing anything whatsoever of the process; this was the *sole burden* of Dr. M'Neile's discourse, and this his sole incontrovertible proof that mesmerism was little else than the 'mystery of iniquity.' '*Is mesmerism divisible?*' was the question asked in those days also. The mere sleep, with its soothing properties, was not objected to; 'we know what sleep is,' said the sermon; but we were not to venture beyond the realms of Somnus into the forbidden ground of unconsciousness to pain. Thanks, a thousand thanks to chloroform! we have escaped that nonsense. We have escaped the taunts of the sceptical surgeon, on the one side, and we have escaped the reproofs of the superstitious religionist on the other—for an anæsthetic operation is an everyday occurrence. Still, in the eyes of the popular preacher at St. Jude's (unless he has written his recantation), Dr. Maitland will be regarded as not far superior to 'a writer in *The Zoist*;' and all his scruples respecting clairvoyance will not compensate for his adhesion to surgical mesmerism. In fact, Dr. Maitland patronizes the black art only in a subordinate degree. What is lawful at Lambeth is licentious at Liverpool; and time and accidental circumstances make the only difference between him and one of ourselves. And eight years back, had our learned librarian, who wishes to see a 'mesmerie hospital well supported and well filled,' but travelled to the great mart of commerce, he would have had to pay the penalty of his rash benevolence, and our anti-clairvoyant would have been pointed at as one that was leagued with 'familiar spirits;'—not, indeed, the great spirits that govern the higher phenomena, but those inferior sprites that simply preside over mesmerie insensibility, and bring human and Christian victims into an awful condition of unconsciousness and ease! Does not this fact offer a lesson to those who raise hasty scruples about matters of science? Or rather might it not furnish an amusing chapter for the second part of our author's *Illustrations and Enquiries relating to Mesmerism*?*

"We have, however, to thank Dr. Maitland for his honor-

"* Dr. M'Neile, in his sermon (p. 147), expressly raised the charge of 'dealing with familiar spirits,' on the ground of an induced and painless sleep; referring, in fact, to the identical passages of Scripture, which Dr. M. himself uses."

able testimony. He broadly declares that he has long been persuaded of the reality of mesmerism, in its common phenomena; and, respecting clairvoyance itself, he regards the evidence to it as so overwhelming, that any discussion on the subject is no longer needful. With a lover of the truth like this, is it too much to hope, that we may still enlist him on our side?

“I remain, Mr. Editor,

“Your humble servant,

“GEORGE SANDBY.”

Extract from an article by Dr. Elliotson in Zoist, No. XXVIII.

In the same number of *The Zoist* that contains A. B.'s article upon Dr. Maitland, Dr. Elliotson has the following remarks, p. 447;—

“Dr. Maitland's readers would suppose that he had seen in *The Zoist* an exhortation to found philosophy on man. His words are, p. 48,

“‘But among the advocates and practitioners of mesmerism, there are many who adopt the Bible, and are not willing to see all religious belief swept away to make room for something contradistinguished as a true philosophy, and founded on man instead of God.’

“The passage in *The Zoist* to which he refers for this misrepresentation, has no such words; it says, ‘founded on the *physiology* of man,’ *i. e.*, upon the handywork of Dr. Maitland's Creator. The physiology of man can mean only the laws of human nature; and moral philosophy ought to be so founded.

“But this is not the whole of Dr. Maitland's misrepresentation. He quotes this and a similar passage simply from *The Zoist*, leading his readers to suppose that they were the words of the editors: whereas they are no such thing. They are the words of a gentleman, named Atkinson, who was never in any way connected with *The Zoist*, and bear his signature: and they do not occur in any communication sent by him to *The Zoist*, but in a paper read before the Phrenological Society, whose proceedings *The Zoist* regularly recorded, just as the *Athenæum* records the proceedings of various societies; and *The Zoist*, whether it agrees or not with Mr. Atkinson, has no more to do with these statements than the *Athenæum*

with the various statements which occur in the papers read before the societies whose proceedings it records."

. In the *Zoist*, No. XXVI., is an article by Mr. Sandby, entitled, "*Review of Mr. G. Cornwall Lewis's Strictures on Mesmerism and Phrenology*;" and it deserves perusal.

FINIS.



